UC-NRLF
B 3 374 791

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

DAVID ROSS FOTHERINGHAM

2.10

THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA

PRESENTED BY
PROF. CHARLES A. KOFOID AND
MRS. PRUDENCE W. KOFOID

THE CHRONOLOGY

OF THE

OLD TESTAMENT

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

By the Rev.

DAVID ROSS FOTHERINGHAM, M.A.

Queens' College, Cambridge
Curate of Holy Trinity, Haverstock Hill
Chaplain of the Byron Society

CAMBRIDGE
DEIGHTON BELL AND CO.
LONDON GEORGE BELL AND SONS
1906

Cambridge:
PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

BS637
F6

PREFACE.

THE following dissertation has been written in such moments as could be spared from the performance of pressing parochial duties. It is hoped however that it will shew no sign either of undue haste or of lack of preparation. Indeed, since chronology has been the author's study or his recreation from his childhood, it may be said that many years have each contributed their toll to the production of the little volume. In one respect the chronology that is advocated here may be regarded as a reversion to schemes and systems of an earlier date. This is true in that it is essentially a Biblical Chronology, and has been deduced almost entirely from the Hebrew records. Synchronism with Assyrian and other history serves to test and to establish the truth of results that have been already attained, but it is too slight to provide a solid foundation for an alternative system, and the attempt to make it such has led to disaster. The hope is expressed that the present enquiry may tend to a clearer view of historical sequence and may to some extent replace the elaborate chronological systems of past centuries that have failed to satisfy the demands of recent criticism.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE KINGS

Part I 1

Part II 28

Part III 48

THE FALL OF SAMARIA 68

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE JUDGES 77

THE DATE OF THE EXODUS 90

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE PRIESTLY CODE . . 101

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE PROPHETS 111

EGYPTIAN CHRONOLOGY 115

CHRONOLOGY OF ASSYRIA, ETC. 130

SOME OTHER CHRONOLOGICAL SYSTEMS . . . 136

ADDITIONAL NOTE 141

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE KINGS.

PART I.

THE Chronology of the period of the Kings has attracted more attention than that of any other period of Hebrew History. And naturally so: for a central authority affords a basis for exact chronological reckonings that are simply impossible when the government is distributed between a number of scattered and irresponsible judges. Hence it is that while the chronology of other periods has always been vague and uncertain, that of the Kings has been regarded as tolerably well fixed; and the dates originally computed by Petavius and Ussher have been generally accepted, with only the slightest modifications, from their first publication till almost our own day.

Now all this is changed. The long-received Petavian chronology is totally rejected, and we have

in its place a large and increasing number of chronological systems, perpetually warring with one another, and none giving any promise of permanent satisfaction.

The reason for this is soon apparent. The Received Chronology was based entirely on the Hebrew Records, for the simple reason that no other data were then available. Modern discoveries have revealed a discrepancy of at least forty years between the dates given by Petavius and Ussher, and those derived from Assyrian Inscriptions: and since the authority of the Assyrian Inscriptions is unquestionable, that of the Hebrew Records has fallen into disrepute. It should be remembered, however, that the Hebrew Records now in our possession are derived from older records that in respect of age and authority are equal to the Assyrian Monuments themselves. Whatever error therefore may be detected in the Petavian chronology, or in its modern rivals, it is to be supposed that the original Hebrew chronology is as correct as that of Assyria.

The difficulty is that the Hebrew chronology has been so long identified with the Petavian system that it is hardly possible to dissociate them now. Scaliger was the first of scientific chronologers. Petavius shewed greater precision in his work; he and Ussher laboured with immense ingenuity and indefatigable patience; and as a result their chronology has been

generally received for three hundred years, and quoted with a degree of confidence and certainty that they would hardly have claimed for it themselves. The tendency now is to repudiate it almost completely.

Yet for this period the Hebrew chronology is generally clear and simple. There are of course cases of doubt or difficulty. These cases were not unknown to Petavius and Ussher, and their proposed solutions have been embodied in what, on the analogy of the Elzevirs' *Textus Receptus*, we may call the Received Chronology. If it can be shewn that other solutions are equally admissible, or even preferable, we shall have the basis for a Revised Hebrew Chronology: and if it should appear that this Revised Chronology is in harmony with the contemporary records of Assyria, Babylon, and Egypt, then it may be accepted as probably, or tentatively, true.

It will be well to consider first the different Hebrew Records, their respective values, and the nature and extent of the errors to which we are liable from our dependence upon them.

The first and most important of those authorities is the directly historical record contained in the Books of Kings and Chronicles. Besides these we have incidental chronological references in the Prophets, and we have Josephus' Antiquities of the Jews. All these authorities were at the disposal of Petavius and Ussher; on them alone the Received Chronology is

based; and since all other authorities are necessarily partial and fragmentary, they must still form the basis of any stable Chronology of the Period.

The first source of error or difficulty in our chronology might be expected to lie in discrepancies between our different authorities. There appear to be three cases of discrepancy between Kings and Chronicles, and in each case the reading in Kings is preferable. Thus in 2 Chron. xvi. 1 we read: "In the six and thirtieth year of the reign of Asa, Baasha king of Israel went up against Judah." It appears however from 1 Kings xvi. 8 that Baasha had been dead ten years by this time, and since the chronology of Kings at this point is too exact to be questioned, it appears that the writer of the Chronicles has given a wrong date in this particular instance. Again, in 2 Chron. xxii. 2 we read: "Forty and two years old was Ahaziah when he began to reign," which would make him two years older than his father Jehoram (2 Chron. xxi. 5). In this case the true age of Ahaziah ("Twenty and two years") is given in 2 Kings viii. 26. Finally in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 9 we read: "Jehoiachin was eight years old when he began to reign," which makes him an unfit object for the stern judgement that follows: "He did that which was evil in the sight of the LORD," and altogether destroys the force of Jeremiah's curse (Jer. xxii. 30): "Write ye this man childless." In this case also it is

sufficiently clear that the true age, eighteen years, is that given in 2 Kings xxiv. 8. The Books of Kings are far richer in chronological material than the Chronicles: the Chronicles contain very few or no independent data, and are the less trustworthy in the case of matter common to both. For all these reasons the Books of Kings will be uniformly preferred, and comparatively little use made of our present Books of Chronicles. It must be borne in mind, however, that the Books of Kings themselves are only authoritative in so far as they are correct copies or extracts from the original Chronicles of the Kings of Israel or Judah.

The numbers of the Septuagint frequently differ from the Massorete Text, and different manuscripts of the Septuagint differ from one another. But these discrepancies will be found to be of the nature of false readings rather than independent authorities, and therefore have no chronological importance. Some of these, however, will be found to deserve attention for the instruction they afford in the rise of error and misunderstanding. The discrepancies found in Josephus are of more importance, for he is writing an independent work, and he may have had access to authorities unknown to us. For this reason it is desirable that his numbers should always be quoted, and due attention paid to them, but they will not be found superior to those given in the Books of Kings.

The prophetical allusions may be discussed as they arise.

The Books of Kings provide us with five tables of figures: The number of years in the reign of every king of each kingdom: the year of the reign of the contemporary king in which he ascended the throne: the age of the king of Judah, but not Israel, at his accession: and Josephus adds as a sixth, the age of the king of Judah at his death.

The question of the kings' ages is one of considerable importance, and it is surprising that previous chronologers should have paid so little attention to it. The following table contains all the information we have on the subject:—

King's name	Age at accession	Years of reign	Age at death [Josephus]	Notes
Saul	[30][a]	2[b]	...	[a] See 1 Sam. xiii. 1 and Marginal Note, R.V.
Ishbaal	40	2	...	
David	30	40	70	
Solomon	...	40[c]	94	[b] 20, Josephus
Rehoboam	41	17	57	[c] 80, Josephus
Abijah	...	3	...	
Asa	...	41	...	
Jehoshaphat	35	25	60	
Jehoram	32	8	40	
Ahaziah	22[d]	1	23	[d] 42, Chron.
Athaliah	...	6	...	
Jehoash	7	40	47	
Amaziah	25	29	54	
Uzziah	16	52	68	
Jotham	25	16	41	

King's name	Age at accession	Years of reign	Age at death [Josephus]	Notes
Ahaz	20	16	36	
Hezekiah	25	29	54	
Manasseh	12	55	67	
Amon	22	2	24	
Josiah	8	31	39	
Jehoahaz	23	(3 m.)	23	
Jehoiakim	25	11	36	
Jehoiachin	18[e]	(3 m.)	...	[e] 8, Chron.
Zedekiah	21	11	...	

Now a glance at this table will shew that the figures against the names of the seven kings before Jehoshaphat are very vague and fragmentary. In some cases the numbers given are clearly impossible, in others they are obviously only the roughest approximations, and in others again we have no hint of the ages at all. The table is of little value or importance prior to the reign of Jehoshaphat.

It will also appear that the third column of figures is simply the sum of the first and second columns, except in the case of Rehoboam. It has therefore no independent value of its own; but it is worth retaining, because it will appear in the sequel that in some cases a king's reign might be dated from either of two events, and this column suggests, if it does not altogether determine, from which of the two it actually is dated.

Closer examination will shew the frequency of

multiples of the number five in the first column. Such multiples occur no less than four times in the five consecutive reigns of Amaziah, Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah; and five times among the nine reigns from Jehoshaphat to Hezekiah, and in three of these the number is twenty-five.

The natural inference seems to be that these multiples of five may be round numbers or approximations to the true age of the king. So that while in the case of the first seven kings the ages are not given with any degree of certainty at all, in the case of the next nine kings they are given sometimes exactly and sometimes approximately, and only in the case of the last seven are they given with exact and complete accuracy.

This conclusion is one of considerable importance, and supplies us at once with the true solution of a long-standing difficulty. From the figures as they stand in the table it will be seen that Ahaz appears as the father of Hezekiah at the age of eleven. Now we have several instances of paternity at an early age among these kings, but none so low as this. On closer examination however we see that the recorded ages of Ahaz and Hezekiah are probably only approximations, and where approximations are made to the nearest multiple of five there is a latitude of two years and a half on either side of the recorded age, within which latitude the true age may be expected

to fall. Now if the age of Ahaz has been under-estimated by two years, and that of Hezekiah over-estimated by two years, both of which suppositions are easily admissible, the true age of Ahaz at Hezekiah's birth will come out as fifteen instead of eleven, although no actual violence has been done to any of the Scriptural numbers. I am tempted to dwell on this case at some length, for the difficulty is a famous one; and not a few critics have endeavoured to meet it by deliberately altering the ages assigned to one of the kings. Such a drastic remedy is hardly ever to be justified, and it is far more likely to immerse one in deeper error than to guide him into truth. On the other hand, most modern chronologers have neglected the kings' ages altogether, and wishing for various reasons to reduce the reign of Ahaz from sixteen years to six, they have ended by dating the birth of Hezekiah in the tenderest years of his father's infancy, thus affording a striking instance of the fatuity of attempting to correct the recorded numbers by means of guesswork. But of this more anon.

Since the kings married young and were generally succeeded by their eldest sons, it is hardly probable that any of them would be past middle life at their son's birth. The greatest ages appear to be as follows: Jehoshaphat 28; Amaziah 38; Uzziah 43; Hezekiah 42; Manasseh 45. It sometimes happened, however, that a king associated his son with him on

the throne for some time before his death. This is known to have been the case with David, Jehoshaphat, and Uzziah, and good reasons will subsequently appear for supposing it to have been the case with Amaziah and Hezekiah. In these instances therefore the real ages of the kings at their sons' birth will be less than the ages given above, by the length of the dual monarchy. The case of Manasseh is somewhat different, but it would appear that he was succeeded by one of his younger sons. For Amon seems to have been born at least four years after Manasseh's Assyrian captivity (2 Kings xxi. 19; 2 Chr. xxxiii. 21), and it must certainly have been before his captivity that Manasseh made his children pass through the fire in the Valley of the Son of Hinnom (2 Kings xxi. 6; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6).

So much for the ages of the Kings of Judah. The subject is one of considerable interest, for though the figures are insufficient to form a complete basis for chronology in themselves, yet they are often suggestive of the true solution of difficulties that will arise in dealing with other figures, and they furnish a series of valuable checks on the accuracy of chronology derived from other sources; so that it is greatly to be regretted that they have been so much neglected.

Passing on from the kings' ages to the years of their reign, we find that these are doubly recorded.

First by a simple statement of the number of years each king occupied on the throne, and secondly by the year of the contemporary king's reign in which he ascended it. In each case there is a possibility of misunderstanding that it will be well to remove before proceeding further.

First then, what is the exact meaning of the oft-repeated expression, "The *n*th year of King X"? Its meaning in modern phraseology is familiar to all. Queen Victoria ascended the throne on the 20th of June, 1837, and the first year of her reign extended from that day till the 19th of June, 1838. Consequently her 60th year, for instance, extended from the 20th of June, 1896, to the 19th of June, 1897. But this method of giving dates is found only in Parliamentary and official documents, and is quite unsuitable for common use. For all business purposes, as well as for the purposes of History, Chronology, and Astronomy, we have recourse to the reckoning *Anno Domini*. The Hebrews, however, had no such consecutive reckoning as this until Maccabean times, and were obliged to give their dates by the year of the king's reign. But unless the king happened to begin his reign on the first day of the year, they would find themselves confronted by the intolerable anomaly of an inconsistency between the Regnal Year and the Calendar Year. There are two ways by which this inconvenience may be avoided, and nations

that have depended on the Regnal Year for their dates have been obliged to adopt one of them. We may treat the year in which a reign changes as if it were two years, so that 1837 would be called the eighth year of William IV from the 1st of January till the 19th of June, and the first of Victoria from the 20th of June till the 31st of December; and then we would begin the second year of Victoria on the 1st of January, 1838. Or we may treat the whole of 1837 as the last year of William IV, and 1838 as the first (not second) year of Victoria. One or other of these methods must be adopted. The Assyrians generally adopted the first: the Babylonians always the second. It appears that the Israelites also adopted the first, and that the Jews inconsistently followed sometimes one and sometimes the other.

An even more common expression is this one:— "X reigned *n* years." Now if the reigns had all been stated exactly in years, months, and days, there would be no difficulty here, and chronology would be reduced to compound addition. As a matter of fact however when the reign exceeds a year we very rarely trouble to specify the months, weeks, or days; and the Hebrews in like manner stated the lengths of their kings' reigns in terms of years only. The question for the chronologer to determine is the proper allowance to make for the unexpressed months and days. As in the former case, it seems desirable

to refer to our modern usage first, and then see how far ancient usage differed from it.

The usual plan in dealing with intervals of time longer than a year is to omit the odd months altogether. Thus, "Forty years old" may mean "Forty years, and eleven months." In dealing with the reigns of kings, however, we adapt the reign to the Calendar; so that the odd months are omitted if they do not extend into a new year, and counted as a whole year if they do. Thus Victoria is credited with an additional year on the strength of twenty-two days in January, 1901, and George III with sixty years instead of 59, on the strength of twenty-nine days in 1820. On the other hand the unfortunate Harold, though he reigned nine months, is credited with nothing at all: for the nine months, extending from January to October, 1066, did not include a New Year's Day.

Now the Hebrews were obliged to adapt the Regnal Years to the Calendar Year much more closely than we are; and if we naturally adapt our estimate of the length of a reign to the changes of the Calendar Year, it seems reasonable to suppose that the same course would appear as natural to them. The same principle however leaves room for a divergency in practice. Notice has been taken of the curious way in which the year in which a change of reign took place was counted both to the old king

and to the new king, was in fact treated as two years. Now in a country where this practice prevailed, such as Israel, each reign would appear one year longer than it would be described in our modern system, the king being credited both with the broken year of his accession and the broken year of his death, and each of these broken years being counted as a whole one. Thus George III would be credited with 61 years instead of 60, as with us; and conversely a modern chronologer must credit Jeroboam with 21 years instead of 22.

Before leaving this subject it is necessary to refer to two misapprehensions. It has been suggested that in omitting the odd months and fractions, the historian would credit each king with the integral number of years that came nearest to his actual reign. Thus $52\frac{1}{4}$ years would be entered as 52, while $28\frac{3}{4}$ would appear as 29. This savours of the mathematician rather than of the chronologer; and we have already seen that it is not so much the value of the fraction, or the number of the months, that determines the length of our estimate, as the accident of their containing a New Year's Day.

It has also been sometimes stated as though it were a matter of importance, that fractions of a year may be counted as a whole year. The real point, however, is that fractions of a year may be counted as two whole years. Thus a king who ascends the

throne in November and dies in the following May has in reality reigned only six months. Yet a modern chronologer would credit him with one year, and an ancient Israelite with two years. The general effect of this curious system of counting, which results in the gain of a year every time the sceptre changes hands, is most clearly seen in the case of the six Israelite kings contemporary with Asa of Judah.

The system underlying Hebrew chronology is thus tolerably clear, and if the process of clearing it has been somewhat tedious, it must be remembered that eminent historians and chronologers have fallen into simple errors and misunderstandings, from which a closer attention to detail would have saved them. The Hebrew chronology lies under a disadvantage, however, when compared with the Assyrian, owing to the fact that the original records have not been preserved, and though the authority of the originals is unquestionable, there are many points in the long line of transmission at which errors may have been introduced. Our present Books of Kings and Chronicles are not of course the original and official records, but admittedly only extracts therefrom.

When purely modern misunderstandings have been set aside, the chronologer may still find himself brought into contact with three kinds of error. These are errors of the Narrative, errors of the Words, and errors of the Numbers.

Errors of the Narrative are generally due to the fact that the majority of historians are not really chronologers, and so they either do not describe the events in strict chronological order, or they describe a series of events in close connexion without any note as to the passage of time or change of year. Thus after a simple note to the effect that it is the fourteenth year of Hezekiah we have an account, not in strict chronological order, of Hezekiah's sickness, the embassy of Merodach-Baladan, the war with Assyria, the alliance with Egypt, the invasion of Judah by Sennacherib, and the destruction of Sennacherib's army, not to mention the allusion to Sennacherib's assassination, which occurred more than twenty years later. Now as a matter of fact this series of events stretched over three years and extended till the seventeenth year of Hezekiah, but no other note of time is given than that at the beginning of the narrative, "the fourteenth year of Hezekiah."

Errors of the narrative may also arise from ignorance of the exact course of events in foreign countries. Thus in 2 Kings xviii. 9 the siege of Samaria is attributed to Shalmaneser when it should have been attributed to his successor Sargon. It is right to notice however that these verses are not found here in their proper context, but as an interpolation in Jewish history, and that in the account of the Fall

of Samaria given in due sequence in Israelite history, in the seventeenth chapter, the conquering king's name is not mentioned. Hoshea is there described as the servant of Shalmaneser, and as bringing him presents (2 Ki. xvii. 3), which is undoubtedly a true account, but it was Shalmaneser's successor that led Hoshea into captivity. A corresponding ignorance of Israelite history is shewn in the Assyrian monuments, where Jehu is described, most inappropriately, as the son of Omri.

Errors of the Words are due to misunderstandings of the originals from which our present authorities are taken. The Books of Kings are professedly not originals themselves, but excerpts from official documents that have long since perished. Now in making these excerpts the author will generally give the sense of the original, but will frequently recast it into his own words. In this process of recasting there lies a serious danger of error, and it would be wonderful indeed if the books were entirely free from it. In the present enquiry we deal only with such errors as are likely to affect the chronology; and though it is impossible as yet to say with certainty where errors of the words are to be found, it is at least possible to indicate the places in which they are mostly to be met.

As a rule the account of each king's reign opens with a notice of his age at accession, the year of the

contemporary king's reign at the time, and the total number of years in his own reign. Probably no doubt will be felt that these items are copied directly from the official records and are worthy of all confidence. It occasionally happens, however, that other chronological notes are inserted at other places, and such notes are presumably due to the compilers of the Books of Kings or Chronicles. In this case the note may well be viewed with suspicion, for though there can be no doubt but that the compiler would copy the number itself exactly as it stood before him, yet by putting it into a context of his own he might unwittingly mislead the chronologer. The clearest instance of this occurs in the case of King Uzziah, or Azariah. In 2 Kings xv. 2 we read in the official note that he was sixteen years old when he began to reign. But in 2 Kings xiv. 21 we read that after the assassination of Amaziah, "All the people of Judah took Azariah, who was sixteen years old, and made him king in the room of his father." Now the context of this second notice is obviously not from the official records, but simply a statement of the historian, and therefore liable to error. So if it should appear in the sequel that Uzziah (or Azariah) had been king for 23 years in the lifetime of his father, and that though he was 16 at his first accession, he was actually 39 at his father's death, it must be borne in mind that our contradiction will not be with the

official records or the formal extract taken from them, but with a casual reference in which the right number has been preserved in the wrong verbal context.

Such incidental references are not uncommon. In one case (2 Chr. xvi. 13) the reference results in a not very important confusion between a Cardinal number and its Ordinal. A second case (2 Kings i. 17), which is possibly spurious, involves a curious misunderstanding and will be dealt with in detail later. A third (2 Kings ix. 29) seems to be little more than a verse misplaced. 2 Kings xiv. 17 appears to be unexceptionable, but from the parallel in Josephus (9 *Antiq.* x. 3) may involve another case of confusion between Cardinal and Ordinal. The next case (2 Kings xv. 30) is more startling, for it contains a reference to the twentieth year of Jotham, who reigned only sixteen! Yet even here there is no actual error, for though the reference cannot be regarded as official or authentic, yet as a matter of fact the event in question actually did occur nineteen years after Uzziah's death and Jotham's succession.

It remains for us to deal with the case of Error of Numbers, and since chronology is a mathematical science, these errors will be the most serious of all. To begin with, however, it ought to be granted that in some respects Numbers are less capable of error than either Words or Sentences. One may suppose

that when John is writing to the Angels of the Seven Churches of Asia there may be a great deal of dispute as to who John was, and what is meant by Angels, or by Churches, as well as vast diversity among geographers as to the confines of Asia. But no one so far as I am aware has ever doubted what is meant by Seven. In the same way the writer of the Books of Kings may conceivably make mistakes as to the true sequence of events, or the names of foreign kings, or he may be uncertain as to the reference intended, but he can make no mistake nor feel any uncertainty in the case of the number itself. It seems, therefore, only natural to suppose that whatever may become of the rest of the narrative, the numbers contained in it will prove an almost infallible standard.

It is important to emphasize this, because almost all critics have proceeded on precisely the opposite supposition. They treat the numbers as the least trustworthy part of the books, and supposing them to be full of errors, they have no scruple in altering them at will. Now it is perfectly true that wherever an error exists, it is most likely to shew itself in the Number. Words are capable of infinite gradations of meaning. Numbers are not. Words may be smoothed into harmony with our theories. Numbers cannot. Again it is perfectly true that wherever an alteration is wanted, the number is the easiest thing to alter. To alter a word may reduce the sentence

to nonsense, or cause us to rewrite a whole verse; but a number may be altered by a stroke of the pen, and in any case the new number will give as good sense as the old one (in that particular place) even though the sense be a false one. The temptation therefore is great, and the sin is easy. It should be added that the consequences are disastrous.

It was shewn on p. 6 that we are not dealing with one series of numbers, but with five. The study of the Received Chronology of Petavius and Ussher shews that these five series dovetail into one another with such exactitude as to convince us of the correctness of all. The emendations that have been proposed have seldom any effect but that of reducing the whole to confusion. In dealing with the Books of Kings it must be borne in mind too that we are dealing with the work of an exceedingly careful and minutely painstaking writer. We have also to deal with a language where numbers were written at full length and not contracted into figures. And finally we have to deal with a series of exceptionally accurate scribes. If there are any errors at all in the numbers, they must be such as would result from overcarefulness rather than from carelessness. For this reason if we venture to make any correction at all we shall be bound not only to shew what is the true number, but also how the original error arose and came to be incorporated into such a carefully written text.

I believe there is just one such error. In 2 Kings xvi. 1, we read: "In the seventeenth year of Pekah the son of Remaliah, Ahaz the son of Jotham king of Judah began to reign." It is probable that instead of "seventeenth" the original reading, or the official record, was "seventh." The chronology of this particular period is full of difficulties, and it is impossible to reconcile all the numbers in the Hebrew text with the Assyrian monuments, or even with one another. It is quite clear that one number at least is wrong, and indeed the majority of critics think that many are wrong. That is a question that may be left for the present: in the present writer's opinion all the other numbers can be justified, but for many reasons this particular number seems to be hopelessly indefensible. But if "seventh" were the true reading, we should not have "seventeenth" in our copies unless the scribe or the editor thought he had good reason for making the alteration. As it happens a good reason is easily found. Only seven verses earlier (2 Kings xv. 32) the scribe had written, "In the second year of Pekah...began Jotham to reign... and he reigned sixteen years." Now a scribe who had just written down the fact that Jotham began to reign in the year 2, and reigned 16 years, would naturally expect his son to succeed him in the year 17 or 18. When then he found instead that that son began to reign in the year 7, the temptation to alter

"seven" to "seventeen" would be very strong: probably the correction would appear to be certain, but in reality instead of removing a difficulty it creates one. For we have already seen that Jotham began his reign during his father's lifetime (2 Kings xv. 5) and if this regency lasted eleven years, as will appear in the sequel, we have only five years left for Jotham's independent reign, and these five years would extend from the second of Pekah to the seventh. On the other hand, if Ahaz began his reign in the 17th of Pekah, and Pekah was succeeded by Hoshea in the 12th of Ahaz (2 Kings xvii. 1) then Pekah's reign must have lasted at least 28 years: but as a matter of fact it was only 20 years (2 Kings xv. 27). The result is then that by his correction the editor, under circumstances of great temptation, removed an imaginary difficulty and introduced a real one. It will be found as we proceed that this is the usual result of tampering with the figures given by our authorities, and it cannot be too strongly insisted that no chronologer has a right to alter the numbers given in the Books of Kings unless he can not only shew good reasons for believing his own numbers to be better, but can also shew what good reason must have influenced the writer in introducing the (presumably) false figures that need correction.

Having discussed at such length the errors to which the Hebrew writings are liable, those to which

the Assyrian and other monuments are liable may be dealt with more lightly. In this case we have the advantage of possessing the originals themselves, so that errors of words or numbers are impossible: at the same time we may always meet with errors of narrative, and one of these was cited on p. 17. There are indeed reasons why these monuments should be peculiarly liable to errors of this class. The monuments generally commemorate a battle, a siege, or a campaign; and ignorance of foreign affairs is never greater than in time of war. The dispositions and movements of an enemy's forces are never really well known. The question whether a king commands in person or is represented by his general; whether a defeated leader actually falls in battle or makes good his escape; all these and many other things are frequently unknown to the victor. Remembering too the natural tendency of the human mind, nowhere more clearly shewn than on monumental inscriptions, to exaggerate successes and to minimize defeats, it will not be thought wonderful if the Assyrian monuments sometimes leave a wrong impression as to the actual course of events. Thus when on the Behistun inscriptions Darius is found victorious in a great battle, and somewhat later is again found victorious in an equally great battle over the same enemies, but several days' march nearer to his own capital, it may be reasonably conjectured that something not of the

nature of a victory had intervened between these two encounters. Similarly when Sennacherib exultingly describes his march into Palestine, the capture of the fortified cities of Judah, the tribute demanded from Hezekiah, the blockade of Jerusalem, and the return to Nineveh, we may suppose that he left it to a kind of historical second-sight to supply the reason for this last manœuvre. Our newspapers shew clearly the difficulty of obtaining exact and trustworthy accounts of all that happens at the front, especially when the war is being carried on at a great distance from the capital; and 2500 years ago the difficulty was much greater.

But when once the date of an event has been given in unmistakable terms by a contemporary monument, there is no room left for further discussion. The difficulty sometimes is to determine what dates have been unmistakably given on the monuments. Tiglath-Pileser spent six consecutive campaigns (B.C. 743—738) in conquering the nations on the shores of the Mediterranean, and the names of the conquered kings are all given in one general list. But it by no means follows that all made their submission at the same time. On the contrary, it is certain that they were only gradually worn out: that some yielded early, and others late. So that when we meet with the names of Menahem of Israel and Uzziah of Judah in this list, we need more precise information before

we can say exactly in which of the six campaigns they submitted to Tiglath-Pileser. In the absence of any formal law of evidence to guide the chronologer, it seems desirable to insist on the flaws that may be found in the testimony of even the best witnesses. And as a reward it will be found that when the proper personal equation has been applied to every witness, whether Hebrew, Egyptian, Babylonian, or Assyrian, the seeming contradictions between them have a wonderful habit of disappearing altogether.

Before passing on from this Introduction it seems well to remark that there is an ever-present possibility of meeting with discrepancies between two authorities even where we have no reason to suppose that either is in error. Attention has already (page 12) been drawn to the fact that two different ways of adapting the Regnal Year to the Calendar Year result in a necessary and permanent difference of one year. For this reason dates given by the Assyrian records appear to be a year later than those given by the Babylonian, although there is no real contradiction between them. In the same way the Fall of Jerusalem took place in what the Babylonians styled the eighteenth year of Nebuchadrezzar, and the Jews the nineteenth. Here again there is no real contradiction: indeed the preservation of both numbers enables us to fix the date (B.C. 587) with absolute certainty, whereas if only one number had been

preserved there would be some doubt as to whether we should not prefer the preceding or the following year.

Another possible source of discrepancy, but not of real contradiction, is due to ambiguities in the Calendar. Thus Charles I was beheaded on the 29th of January in the year that the English called 1648, and the Scots 1649. The discrepancy was simply due to the fact that the Scots began the year on the Feast of Circumcision, and the English on that of the Annunciation. Now if such a discrepancy as this is possible in the case of two allied nations, clearly it is still more so in the case of disunited, and frequently hostile nations. The vagaries of the Lunar Calendar, with a year irregularly containing twelve months or thirteen, add to the chances of confusion. So that once more we find that different nations may differ by a year, *but not more*, in the date of the same event, without in any way contradicting one another, or lessening the weight of the other's testimony.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE KINGS.

Part II.

It will be found convenient to divide the whole period of the kings into five shorter periods. The first of these will extend from the first establishment of the Monarchy under Saul to the death of Solomon and the Division of the Kingdom; the second will extend from that point to the Usurpations of Jehu and Athaliah; the third to the Deposition of the House of Jehu; the fourth to the Fall of Samaria; and the fifth will include the whole period of Judah's Survival, ending with the Destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadrezzar.

The chronology of the first of these periods demands but little attention. Saul reigned two years (1 Sam. xiii. 1). The years were eventful ones, in the midst of stirring times, and they have been described with unusual fulness. It is possible too that several occurrences in this reign have been described more than once in different forms, and that a certain amount of legend still remains interwoven with the

history. In any case many chronologers have felt a difficulty in confining Saul's reign to so short a period. Josephus (6 *Antiq.* xiv. 9) lengthens the reign to twenty years, eighteen years with Samuel and two years alone. There seems to be no real authority for this, and the conjecture of other chronologers that the reign extended to forty years appears to have even less in its favour. In spite therefore of the testimony of Josephus, and possibly of St Paul (Acts xiii. 21), it seems best to follow the numbers given in 1st Samuel, and allow Saul a reign of two years only.

Saul's son Ishbaal also reigned two years (2 Sam. ii. 10), but was never acknowledged by the tribe of Judah. David reigned $7\frac{1}{2}$ years over Judah, and 33 years over all Israel. Solomon's reign lasted 40 years (1 Kings xi. 42). Josephus lengthens the reign to 80 years (8 *Antiq.* vii. 8), but this number appears to be a mere exaggeration, and, as we shall subsequently see, it is contradicted by Josephus' own list of Phoenician kings. Altogether the period covers about 82 years, extending from B.C. 1014 to B.C. 932. According to the Received Chronology Saul, David, and Solomon, each reigned 40 years, and the period extends from B.C. 1095 to B.C. 975. After the death of Solomon and the Division of the Kingdom the chronology becomes much more complicated and interesting.

The chronological material at our disposal for the second period is succinctly stated in the annexed tables :—

KINGS OF JUDAH.

King's name	Years	Contemporary King of Israel	Year of his reign	Notes
Rehoboam	17	Jeroboam	...	
Abijah	3[a]	„	18th	[a] 6, LXX. (or 16).
Asa	41	„	20th[b]	[b] 24th, LXX. (or 20th).
Jehoshaphat	25	Ahab	4th[c]	[c] 11th of Zimri II,
Jehoram	8[d]	Joram	5th	LXX.
Ahaziah	1	„	11th, 12th	[d] 40, LXX.

KINGS OF ISRAEL.

King's name	Years	Contemporary King of Judah	Year of his reign	Notes
Jeroboam	22	Rehoboam	...	
Nadab	2	Asa	2nd	
Baasha	24	„	3rd	[a] 7 years, LXX. (Co-
Elah	2	„	26th	dex Vat.).
Zimri	(7 days)[a]	„	27th	[b] Zimri II., LXX.
Omri[b]	12	„	27th, 31st	[c] 2nd of Jehoshaphat,
Ahab	22	„	38th[c]	LXX.
Ahaziah	2	Jehoshaphat	17th	[d] 2nd of Joram (2 K.
Joram	12	„	18th[d]	i. 17).

In order to avoid confusion it seems advisable to use the full name, Jehoram, for the fifth king of Judah,

and the contracted name Joram for the ninth king of Israel. There can be no confusion between the two Ahaziahs. It will also be found desirable in dealing with this period to use the era of the Revolt in first calculating the dates, and subsequently to translate them into the ordinary reckoning of years B.C., when we are enabled to do so without fear of mistake. For our present purpose it will be well to begin the year with the 1st of Abib (about April) rather than the 1st of January.

The exact length of the period is given by the sum of the years in the reigns of the kings of Israel, these reigns being each diminished by one in the manner explained in p. 14. The total so obtained is

$$21+1+23+1+0+11+21+1+11=90,$$

so that the deaths of Joram and Ahaziah, and the usurpations of Jehu and Athaliah fall in the 91st year of the Revolt.

The difficulties encountered by chronologers in dealing with this period are neither very numerous nor very formidable. They may be considered as they arise.

First of all one is struck with the number of strange readings found in the Septuagint. The repetition of the name Zimri in the place of Omri is easily accounted for. It is another instance of the not uncommon confusion between *Ain*, the initial letter of Omri, and *Tzade*, the initial of Zimri. The

reading in the Codex Vaticanus which attributes a reign of seven years, instead of seven days, to Zimri I is probably a mere scribal mistake, but one or two of the other readings almost point to a deliberate attempt to revise the chronology of this period.

We return now to the numbers given in the Hebrew Text. A slight difficulty suggests itself in dealing with the date of the accession of Omri. In 1 Kings xvi. 15 *et seq.* we read that in the 27th year of Asa Zimri conspired against Elah, slew him, and held the capital for a week, before he was himself dethroned by Omri. Omri reigned 12 years and died in the 38th of Asa (1 Kings xvi. 29). This account is perfectly clear and easily commends itself to the chronologer. The difficulty is that in 1 Kings xvi. 23 the date of Omri's accession is given not as the 27th of Asa, but as the 31st. The generally accepted explanation is that the civil war between Omri and Tibni lasted four years, and that though Zimri fell in the 27th year of Asa it was not till the 31st that Omri succeeded in making himself master of the whole country. This is perfectly possible, but the consideration of our next difficulty will suggest another and more probable explanation.

In 2 Kings viii. 16 we read: "In the fifth year of Joram the son of Ahab king of Israel, Jehoshaphat being then king of Judah, Jehoram the son of Jehoshaphat king of Judah began to reign." As the

fifth year of Joram falls three years before the close of Jehoshaphat's reign of 25 years, there seems to be no reasonable doubt that the true explanation of the words "Jehoshaphat being then king of Judah," is that given in the margin of the Authorized Version: namely, that Jehoram then began to reign as consort with his father, and did not become sole king till his father's death three years later. This seems simple enough: the difficulty is that in 2 Kings i. 17 the accession of Joram in Israel is dated the second year of Jehoram of Judah. Elsewhere the same event is given, quite correctly, as the eighteenth of Jehoshaphat. The difficulty is to account for this double date.

An explanation is attempted in the margin of the Authorized Version, where we read as a gloss, "The second year that Jehoram was *Pro-rex*." If this explanation were accepted, it would follow that Jehoram was five or six years *Pro-rex*, three years *Co-rex*, and finally four years *Rex*, but perhaps it will be as well to allow this explanation to fall under the weight of its own cumbrousness, and look for a better. The present writer ventures to hope that the following explanation will succeed in removing the difficulty.

If we look at the text of 2 Kings i. 17 we find that the clause containing the difficult date is omitted in the Septuagint, and therefore it comes under a certain amount of suspicion of not being original. Secondly, it is not the normal place for authentic

chronological references, but has the nature of an incidental allusion, as described on page 19. For either of these reasons it would be impossible to regard the date as authoritative or as necessarily free from error. But in accordance with the critical principles already laid down it must not be treated as erroneous unless it is possible to shew how the error arose. This therefore I will endeavour to do.

Attention has frequently been drawn to the manner in which the Israelite monarchy gained a year with every change of reign. This circumstance was of course familiar to the Hebrews of that time, but the fact that the Jewish monarchy adopted a different system of reckoning, as well as the lapse of centuries, helped to obliterate the old Israelite chronology from the memory. By simply forgetting to allow for this peculiarity the chronology is lengthened by as many years as there were kings. The result is that Omri's date is moved from the 27th of Asa to the 31st: Ahab's from the 38th to the 43rd, or 2nd of Jehoshaphat. Ahaziah's to the 24th of Jehoshaphat, and Joram's to the 26th, or second of Jehoram. Traces of this artificial, and false, chronology are found in the Septuagint, and it is not very wonderful that in two casual instances it should have crept into the Hebrew text itself. I am not aware that this explanation has been offered before, but it seems to have the merit of removing two difficulties at once.

A question naturally suggests itself as to what means we have of knowing, where we are brought face to face with two chronologies, which is true and which false. The chronology to which we give the preference is found consistently throughout: the other in two isolated instances, whereof one reference is doubtful, and the other reading might be disputed. The former has every appearance of being directly excerpted from official documents: the latter has not. But a more cogent proof than this is at hand. Joram of Israel and Ahaziah of Judah perished at the same time and in the same catastrophe. Whatever chronology we adopt it is necessary that the dates of their deaths should coincide. According to the one chronology this will be found to be the case; according to the other there will be an interval of three years between them. There can therefore be no doubt which is the true chronology of the period.

Synchronistic references to other nations are few and unimportant in this period. The first and most important is the capture of Jerusalem by Shishak in the fifth year of Rehoboam. Shishak is identical with Sheshonk or Sesonchis, the first king of Manetho's twenty-second dynasty. It happens, however, that Egyptian chronology for the period covered by the twenty-second and twenty-third dynasties is so vague and uncertain, that the synchronism is likely to be of more value to the Egyptologist as a guide to

the date of Shishak, than to the Biblical chronologer as a guide to the date of Rehoboam.

The marriage of Ahab with Jezebel the daughter of Ethbaal, or Ithobalus, affords a synchronism between Israelite and Phoenician chronology. Now according to Josephus (8 *Antiq.* iii. 1) the Foundation of the Temple was laid in the fourth year of Solomon, and eleventh of Hiram. Hiram's reign therefore began seven years before Solomon's and 47 before the Revolt. Elsewhere (*Ap.* i. 18) Josephus extracts the Phoenician chronology from Menander of Ephesus, from which it appears that Ethbaal was the seventh in succession after Hiram, that he was born in the year of the Revolt, and reigned from the year 37 to 69. From the tables on p. 30 or 39 it may be seen that Ahab's father Omri reigned from the year 47 to 58, and Ahab himself from 58 to 79. The synchronism therefore is perfect, but it is curious to notice that it completely refutes the exaggerated reign Josephus himself attributes to Solomon.

The Second Book of Kings opens with the statement that Moab rebelled against Israel after the death of Ahab. The rebellion falls in the brief reign of Ahaziah, and according to Josephus (9 *Ant.* ii. 1) in the second year of the reign. The war is described in greater fulness on the recently discovered Moabite Stone. From this we learn that the conqueror of Moab was Omri, and the whole period of Israelite

occupation extended to forty years. It happens, however, that the three reigns of Omri, Ahab, and Ahaziah only include 34 years. The synchronism is therefore imperfect. The number "forty" however may nearly always be viewed with a certain amount of suspicion when it occurs in Hebrew literature, and it is quite possible that on the Moabite Stone it is meant for nothing more than a rough approximation. It may be remembered however that Omri was "the captain of the host" of Elah, and very likely of Baasha also, so that even if the number forty is meant to be exact, which I do not regard as very probable, Omri may very well have been the conqueror of Moab. It is curious to notice how tardily justice is being done to the fame of the conquering Omri. He passes almost unnoticed in Biblical history. But his fame is brought home to us by Moabite and Assyrian inscriptions, so that nearly two hundred years after his death Israel was still known as "the land of the House of Omri."

Just before the close of this period Israel is brought into contact for the first time with the power of Assyria. The name of the Assyrian king at this time was Shalmaneser. His reign lasted 35 years (B.C. 859—825), in the sixth year of which (B.C. 854) he came into conflict with a powerful confederacy of kings on his western frontier. Among these were Hadadezer or Benhadad, of Damascus, and Ahab of

Israel. A battle was fought at Karkar, or Aroer, in which Shalmaneser claims to have won a decisive victory, though he was apparently unable to follow up his success. Twelve years later (B.C. 842) we find him again in the west. The King of Syria was by this time Hazael, and on him Shalmaneser inflicted a crushing defeat on the heights of Hermon. Damascus was besieged but not captured, and Shalmaneser continued a ravaging and marauding expedition as far as Beyrout, receiving tribute from various kings, and among others from Jehu, "son of Omri."

At this early time it is improbable that Assyria made any great impression upon Israel, unless it were by weakening the power of Israel's rival Syria. The historical importance of Shalmaneser's campaigns is so slight that they are omitted altogether from the Books of Kings. Their chronological value however is inestimable. The dates of the early kings can be accurately calculated only by the era of the Revolt, but these inscriptions enable us at once to transform the dates so obtained into the ordinary reckoning of years before Christ. We have seen that the name of Ahab is given as King of Israel B.C. 854, and that of Jehu B.C. 842. But the table on page 30 will shew that the interval between the death of Ahab and the usurpation of Jehu was 12 years. It follows therefore at once that B.C. 854 must have been the last year of Ahab's reign and B.C. 842 the first of Jehu's. The

chronology of the whole period will therefore appear as given in the annexed table.

Kings of Judah	Year of the Revolt: Received Chron.	Year of the Revolt: Revised Chron.	Years B.C.: Received Chron.	Years B.C.: Revised Chron.	Kings of Israel
Rehoboam	1	1	975	932	Jeroboam
Abijah	18	18	958	915	
Asa	21	20	955	913	
	22	22	954	911	Nadab
	23	23	953	910	Baasha
	46	46	930	887	Elah
	47	47	929	886	Zimri
	47	47	929	886	Omri
	58	58	918	875	Ahab
Jehoshaphat	62	62	914	871	
	79	79	897	854	Ahaziah
	80	80	896	853	Joram
Jehoshaphat } Jehoram }	84	84	892	849	
Jehoram	87	87	889	846	
Ahaziah	91	91	885	842	
Athaliah	92	91	884	842	Jehu

We now pass on to the chronology of the third period, during which the House of Jehu occupied the throne of Israel. The chronological material is given in the two following tables :—

KINGS OF JUDAH.

	Years	Contemporary King of Israel	Year of his reign	Notes
Athaliah	6	Jehu	...	
Jehoash	40	,,	7th	
Amaziah	29	Joash	2nd	[a] 14th, Jos. : see also 2 Kings xiv. 17.
Uzziah, or Azariah	52	Jeroboam II.	27th[a]	

KINGS OF ISRAEL.

	Years	Contemporary King of Judah	Year of his reign	Notes
Jehu	28[b]	Athaliah	...	[b] 27, Jos.
Jehoahaz	17	Jehoash	23rd[c]	[c] 21st, Jos.
Joash	16	,,	37th	
Jeroboam II	41[d]	Amaziah	15th	[d] 40, Jos.
Zechariah	(6 months)	Uzziah	38th	

This period, like the previous one, extends over the space of about ninety years. The number of reigns however is considerably less, and the chronology is a good deal more confused. The result is that the received chronology, which had traced the succession of kings in the former period with almost perfect accuracy, now falls into an error of more than twenty years. The Assyrian monuments afford convincing proof of the existence of this error, and the Hebrew records when rightly understood will be shewn to be in agreement with the Assyrian chronology.

The usurpations of Athaliah and Jehu occurred simultaneously in the year B.C. 842. Athaliah held the throne for six years, and in the seventh (B.C. 836) the rightful heir, Jehoash, succeeded her. Jehu reigned for 28 years and was then succeeded by his son Jehoahaz. After a reign of 17 years Jehoahaz was succeeded by his son Joash. To avoid confusion the full name, Jehoash, will be used in speaking of the Jewish king, and the shorter name, Joash, in speaking of the Israelite one. There is, however, a

slight difficulty here. The interval from the 23rd to the 37th year of Jehoash corresponds to a reign of 15 years, not to one of 17. If we were to accept the figures of Josephus in preference to those of 2 Kings the accession of Jehoahaz would fall two years earlier, and the difficulty would disappear. The numbers given in 2 Kings, however, deserve such confidence that only in the very last resort can we assume that they are mistaken. It would be better to suppose that Jehu associated his son with him on the throne for two years. Indeed since Jehu had been one of Ahab's officers (2 Kings ix. 25), he must have attained a considerable age by this time. The received chronology suggests much the same explanation of the difficulty under a slightly different form. It is there conjectured that Joash reigned for two years in conjunction with Jehoahaz. Which of these two conjectural partnerships is to be preferred is a matter of doubt; and indeed in view of the extremely small nature of the discrepancy (see p. 27), it may be questioned whether it is necessary to accept either conjecture. As it happens, however, the determination of this question does not affect the rest of the chronology. Different temperaments will regard this circumstance as a cruel misfortune that robs us of a clue to the solution of the difficulty, or as a piece of good luck that frees us from the necessity of solving it at all.

In any case Joash's reign began in B.C. 799, whether his father Jehoahaz were alive or dead at the time. Jehoash reigned for 40 years and was succeeded by Amaziah in the second year of Joash, or B.C. 797. Joash reigned 16 years and died in the fifteenth year of Amaziah (B.C. 783). Amaziah was assassinated fifteen years later (2 Kings xiv. 17) and was succeeded by his son Uzziah or Azariah (B.C. 768). Let it be noticed before proceeding further that from the accession of David to the death of Amaziah is a period of 244 years, and that for the whole of this long period the received chronology has been generally satisfactory: indeed, unless the reigns of David and Solomon have been wrongly stated, so perfect is the harmony between our five different sets of figures, that it seems scarcely possible that there is room for an error of more than two or three years in the length of this period. Modern chronologers, such as Duncker, who have departed widely from the calculations of Ussher and Petavius for this period, have generally fared much worse. From this point forward however the chronology becomes much more confused, and the received chronology shews a much larger admixture of error with the truth.

Since Jeroboam II succeeded his father Joash in the 15th year of Amaziah, and Amaziah reigned 29 years, it was only to be expected that the death of Amaziah should occur in the 14th or 15th year of

Jeroboam. Accordingly Josephus (9 *Antiq.* x. 3) actually dates it in Jeroboam's 14th year, and an "incidental allusion" (2 Kings xiv. 17) dates it 15 years after Joash's death. We have already seen that allusions of this sort are not to be regarded as direct and authoritative testimony in the same sense as are the official chronological records with which each reign begins. At the same time the present one appears to be unexceptionable enough, or at the most involves no more than a confusion of the ordinal and cardinal. The real difficulty is that in 2 Kings xv. 1 the accession of Uzziah is officially dated the 27th year of Jeroboam. Accordingly it has been supposed by Hales, and perhaps some other chronologers, that an interregnum of eleven or twelve years followed upon the assassination of Amaziah, and that Judah was without a king from the 15th to the 27th year of Jeroboam's reign. A much more probable explanation than this is embodied in the received chronology and printed as a marginal note in the Authorized Version:—"This is the 27th year of Jeroboam's partnership in the kingdom with his father, who made him consort at his going to the Syrian wars. It is the 16th year of Jeroboam's monarchy."

So far as I am aware the statement as regards the Syrian wars is purely conjectural, but the partnership is sufficiently warranted by the figures. There is a natural prejudice in our minds against assuming too

many such partnerships, for once we have adopted the principle, there is a danger that it may become our master, and by recklessly setting kings on the throne in their fathers' lifetime we may succeed in rubbing out time altogether. Fortunately in dealing with the Hebrew kings we are amply safeguarded against this danger. So many series of numbers have to be satisfied that not only is a partnership at once revealed whenever it occurs, but the accidental assumption of a false partnership would quickly throw the whole chronological system into confusion. It seems certain then that Jeroboam's monarchy only began in the fifteenth year of Amaziah, on the death of his father Joash (B.C. 783), but that for certain reasons, probably from the fact that he had been consort with his father, he counted his reign from a point of time eleven years earlier (B.C. 794).

If Jeroboam counted his reign from the year B.C. 794, so that B.C. 768 was his 27th year, then the 41st, and last year of his reign must have been B.C. 754. This is of course the 15th year after Amaziah's assassination. But in 2 Kings xv. 8 the accession of Zechariah the son of Jeroboam is given as the 38th year of Azariah, or Uzziah. As before, Hales fills the gap with an interregnum. The interregnum of 12 years in Judah has its counterpart in an interregnum of 23 years in Israel. But, as before, an interregnum hardly appears to be the best

or most probable explanation. It seems more likely that as Jeroboam reigned 12 years in consort with his father Joash, so Uzziah should reign for 23 years in consort with Amaziah. Our choice here rests between an interregnum in one kingdom, and a dual kingship in the other. Of interregna we have no trace at any time. Dual kingships are more familiar. David made Solomon king before his death: Jehoshaphat was still king when Jehoram began to reign: Jotham reigned in place of his incapacitated father Uzziah. The argument from analogy therefore is against the interregnum. The prophet Hosea throws his weight into the same scale. Hosea prophesied before the death of Jeroboam II, and after the accession of Hezekiah. Both these events therefore occurred not only in the space of a single lifetime, but even in the space covered by the active manhood of one person. The interval between them was probably 37 years, but if we were to insert the interregna it would be at least sixty, and possibly seventy. Again we may revert to the question of the kings' ages. On the supposition of an interregnum in Israel, Amaziah would be about 38 at Uzziah's birth, an unusually high age. If instead of this we accept the theory of conjoint reigns in Judah, the age of Amaziah is reduced to about 15, an age that appears to have been common enough in the Hebrew monarchy. But more weighty proof, amounting to absolute demonstration,

is now obtainable. Israel has already been twice brought into contact with Assyria. The contact is soon to be renewed. The Assyrian monuments leave no room for the insertion of the interregna: allowing for the dual reigns the period will be found to be of exactly the length they require.

It is certainly curious that after adopting the right solution in the case of Uzziah, the received chronology should adopt the wrong one in the case of Zechariah. It seems as though a dual monarchy must be allowed in Israel rather than an interregnum in Judah, and also an interregnum in Israel rather than a dual monarchy in Judah. The mistake is the more curious when we recollect that after Amaziah had been murdered, it would not be surprising if some time elapsed before his son obtained the crown (as indeed had been the case with Ahaziah and Jehoash) but after the prosperous reign and peaceable end of Jeroboam an interregnum seems most improbable; yet after rightly rejecting the less improbability, the received chronology seems quite content to accept the greater. This is the first serious error to be found in it, and the extent of the error is of course 23 years. By a curious device however the actual length of the supposed interregnum is reduced to eleven years, for after rightly seeing that the 27th year of Jeroboam must be counted from the time of his association with his father, it has been inconsistently supposed by nearly

all chronologers that his 41st year would be counted from his father's death. The following is a table of the kings of this period with their ascertained dates.

	Year of the Revolt		Years B.C.		
Kings of Judah	Received Chron.	Revised Chron.	Received Chron.	Revised Chron.	Kings of Israel
Athaliah	92	91	884	842	Jehu
Jehoash	98	97	878	836	
	120	118	856	815	Jehoahaz
	135	134	841	799	Joash
Amaziah	137	136	839	797	
	140	139	836	794	Joash / Jeroboam
Amaziah / Uzziah	—	142	—	791	
	151	150	825	783	Jeroboam
Uzziah, or Azariah	166	165	810	768	
	192	—	784	—	Interregnum
	203	179	773	754	Zechariah

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE KINGS.

Part III.

The fourth period deals with the fortunes of the Kingdom of Israel from the time of the dethronement of the House of Jehu till the fall of Samaria, and with those of Judah till the reign of Hezekiah. The period is shorter than any of the three already dealt with, but the chronology is intensely interesting and presents a whole series of the most difficult and fascinating problems, for which no satisfactory solution has yet been proposed. We are constantly in touch with the aggressive power of Assyria: Israel has hardly a settled monarchy at all: and the history of the period is little more than an account of Assyrian expeditions, and of coalitions among weaker states to resist them.

As before, the chronological material is exhibited in tabular form:—

KINGS OF JUDAH.

King's name	Years	Contemporary King of Israel	Year of his reign	Notes
Uzziah	52	...	...	
Jotham	16	Pekah	2nd	
Ahaz	16	„	17th[a]	[a] See p. 22
Hezekiah	29	Hoshea	3rd[b]	[b] 4th, Jos.

KINGS OF ISRAEL.

King's name	Years	Contemporary King of Judah	Year of his reign	Notes
Zechariah	(6 months)	Uzziah	38th	
Shallum	(1 month)	„	39th	[c] Died in the
Menahem	10	„	39th	20th (*sic*) year
Pekahiah	2	„	50th	of Jotham,
Pekah	20	„	52nd[c]	2 Kings xv.
Hoshea	9	Ahaz	12th	30

It has been already shewn that the years of Uzziah's reign are counted from his association with his father Amaziah in B.C. 791. Zechariah's short reign of six months therefore falls in B.C. 754 and apparently extends into 753. Shallum played the part of a second Zimri, and after enjoying the sweets of royalty for a month, gave place to Menahem. Menahem retained the throne for ten years or longer (B.C. 753—742) and, being the only one among six who ended his life in peace, was succeeded by his son Pekahiah. Pekahiah reigned two years, and was then

murdered by Pekah (B.C. 740). Meanwhile in Judah Uzziah had been smitten with leprosy, and surrendered the government to his son Jotham. Uzziah apparently died the year after Pekah's accession (B.C. 739) and Jotham reigned alone.

So far all is well. Jotham reigned sixteen years, and his death is given (2 Kings xvi. 1) as the seventeenth year of Pekah. The difficulty is that since Jotham had already been king for some time in his father's lifetime, we would expect him to have died sooner. For it was the usual practice of kings that had been associated with their fathers to count all the years of the joint reign as their own. Thus Jehoram claims 8 years, and not 4; Jehoahaz claims 17 years, and not 15; Uzziah 52, and not 29; and Jeroboam 41, and not 29. So then when Jotham claims only 16 years, we are bound to suspect that his independent reign was considerably less. The length of Jotham's regency is not stated, and can only be determined by reference to other sources.

The assassination of Pekah is dated (2 Kings xv. 30) in the twentieth year of Jotham. The date is a mere incidental allusion and therefore not authoritative, although as a matter of fact it is absolutely correct. Jotham however only reigned 16 years. Hence a note by Ussher is put into the margin of the Authorized Version to explain that the murder occurred "In the fourth year of Ahaz, in the

twentieth year after Jotham had begun to reign." The difficulty here lies in the fact that the accession of Hoshea is dated (2 Kings xvii. 1) in the 12th year of Ahaz. The received chronology is therefore obliged to interpolate an impossible interregnum of nine years between Pekah and Hoshea. The alternative to this would be a partnership of nine years between Jotham and Ahaz, but the recorded ages of the kings (see pp. 6, 7) make this utterly impossible. The only hope seems to lie in falling back on the partnership between Uzziah and Jotham. If this lasted ten years, or thereabouts, the chronology becomes simple again, only then it would follow that the year of Ahaz's accession was not the seventeenth of Pekah, but the seventh. The numbers given in 2 Kings are so uniformly accurate, that one is loth to attempt an emendation except under circumstances of the greatest urgency. It appears however that we are here brought into such circumstances, and if the original reading was "seventh," it has already been shewn on p. 22 how strong would be the temptation to a scribe or an editor to alter it to "seventeenth." This is the only number I am willing to alter, and I trust that the alteration may be deemed to have been justified.

Like a gleam of unexpected light in the midst of Cimmerian darkness comes a reference by the prophet Amos. Amos prophesied immediately before the death of Jeroboam II, "two years before the earth-

quake." This earthquake must have been one of terrible force, for after more than two hundred years it is recalled by Zechariah (xiv. 5) with horror. Now from Josephus (9 *Antiq.* x. 4) we learn that this earthquake was associated with Uzziah's profanation of the Temple, and with his leprosy: so that it must have occurred shortly before the commencement of Jotham's regency. Now Jeroboam died towards the close of the 38th year of Uzziah (B.C. 754), and the earthquake may be dated in the 40th year (B.C. 752) or possibly the 41st (B.C. 751). Now if our conjecture that Jotham was ten years regent is correct, his regency would begin in the 42nd or 43rd year of Uzziah's reign (B.C. 750 or 749). There are circumstances of some vagueness in connexion with the calculation, but in the end the synchronism is very close; and coming from such a source as Amos it must be regarded as strong confirmation of the chronological system here proposed.

But in dealing with the history or chronology of this period primary importance must be attributed to the Assyrian records. It will therefore be well to trace the history of Assyrian aggressions with some little fulness. In B.C. 745 the Empire was usurped by a military adventurer called Pul, who seized the throne and reigned under the name of Tiglath-Pileser. During the previous thirty years a decadent imperial line had been toying with the sceptre, while allowing

Assyria's military glory to melt away. Worthless as Tiglath-Pileser's claim was, he infused new life and vigour into the Empire, and inaugurated a series of brilliant campaigns, in which conquest followed conquest with amazing rapidity.

It was in B.C. 743 that Tiglath-Pileser turned his attention to the West, and the war lasted through six campaigns. The most important incident was the siege of Arpad. The city resisted for more than two years and did not fall until B.C. 740. Its capture was followed by the conquest of the kingdom of Hamath. Hamath at that time was governed by a king named Eniel, who had been in alliance with Uzziah of Judah. Hamath was stormed in B.C. 740. The war however continued to rage for two years longer. Finally in B.C. 738 peace was restored, and all the Syrian provinces lay prostrate at Tiglath-Pileser's feet.

Now it is important to notice exactly what is recorded as regards this war, both in the Hebrew records and in the Assyrian monuments. The war lasted from B.C. 743—738, and it resulted in Tiglath-Pileser's obtaining tribute from Menahem of Samaria, and possibly from Uzziah of Jerusalem. From this it has been hastily assumed that Menahem must have been reigning at the time of the general submission in B.C. 738, and Uzziah at the same time. But this is assuming too much. Uzziah is only mentioned in connexion with the conquest of Hamath, which

occurred in B.C. 740. Nor need we suppose that Menahem was able to resist the Assyrians any longer. Indeed it is very doubtful whether he ever attempted to resist them at all. He certainly paid tribute to Tiglath-Pileser: but that is a very different matter from resisting him, as we shall see.

The exact relations that existed between Menahem and Tiglath-Pileser (or Pul) are tersely described in 2 Kings xv. 19. Hitherto Syria, and not Assyria, had been the great rival of Israel. Assyrian aggression had so far been felt principally by Syria, and in that respect it was rather a help than an injury to Israel. Now when Tiglath-Pileser fell on the West in B.C. 743 the whole force of Syria was put in the field to oppose him. Israel may have viewed this with perfect unconcern: Judah did not bestir itself until Hamath was attacked. But to Menahem domestic affairs were of more urgent importance than foreign politics. He was a mere usurper and cannot have been so foolish as to flatter himself with false ideas of his security. His primary object was to strengthen his own position in Israel and maintain himself on the throne; and when the all powerful King of Assyria appeared in his land, Menahem found the means of obtaining this security, "Menahem gave Pul a thousand talents of silver, *that his hand might be with him to confirm the kingdom in his hand*" (2 Ki. xv. 19). Henceforward Menahem reigned "under

Assyrian protection," and when he died the Assyrian influence was sufficiently powerful to secure the peaceful succession of his son Pekahiah. We may take it then that Menahem's submission was easily made, and that he remained in tributary alliance with Tiglath-Pileser till his death.

After a brief reign of two years Pekahiah was assassinated by Pekah. Pekah set about reversing the traditional policy of Israel. He saw that it was not Syria but Assyria that constituted the real danger to Israel's future independence. For this reason, soon after Tiglath-Pileser had returned to Nineveh, he formed an alliance with Rezin the King of Syria, and sought to create a confederacy of smaller states strong enough to resist the tide of Assyrian conquest. Israel's natural ally was Judah, where Jotham was then king, but Judah appears to have been either indifferent or hostile to the confederacy. Relations between the kingdoms were at least strained, but it is doubtful whether hostilities had actually begun at the time of Jotham's death (B.C. 734, 2 Kings xv. 37).

The death of Jotham was seized by Pekah and Rezin as a suitable opportunity for setting someone on the throne of Judah who would be favourable to the Syrian confederacy. For this purpose they set up a pretender of the name of Ben-Tabeel (Is. vii. 6). Ahaz, the young King of Judah, appealed to Tiglath-

Pileser for assistance; and Tiglath-Pileser was only too glad to embrace the opportunity for a second Syrian war. The war ended in the total defeat of the confederacy, and the conquest of Syria, Israel, Ammon, Moab, Edom, Arabia, and Philistia. The city of Damascus was strong enough to resist for two years, but at length yielded to the Assyrian blockade. Rezin was executed and his subjects transported into captivity.

On the whole the Assyrian account of the war is transparently clear and is a valuable supplement to that given in 2 Kings xvi. and by Isaiah. Tiglath-Pileser describes the transportation of Pekah's subjects into captivity (as described in 2 Kings xvi. 9), but he goes on to add :—

"The land of Beth-Omri...a part of its inhabitants ...I carried away to Assyria. Pekah their king I (kill)ed and I appointed Hoshea to reign over them[1]."

Now if this account of the death of Pekah is correct Pekah's reign can only have extended to seven years instead of twenty ; and in 2 Kings xv. 30 we read, not that Pekah was killed by the King of Assyria, but that Hoshea slew him in a conspiracy. Some little ingenuity will be required to reconcile the two accounts of Pekah's death, and it will be difficult to shake our faith in the Hebrew figures or story.

[1] I have put part of the word "(kill)ed" within brackets, because others do so.

It seems more probable that Pekah should succeed in effecting his escape; the experience of our own wars, and especially of our desert wars, shews us how difficult it often is to say whether a defeated general has actually perished or not, and as a matter of fact it may be doubted whether Tiglath-Pileser even claimed to have killed Pekah. The all-important verb is marked as doubtful in translations of the inscription, and possibly it is partly conjectural. Did Tiglath-Pileser ever claim to have done more than defeat or dethrone Pekah? If not, there is no difficulty in the matter. Hoshea in any case is shewn as the mere puppet of Assyria both in this inscription and in the Hebrew record (2 Kings xvii. 3), and he had to wait twelve years longer before he actually reigned over Israel.

Tiglath-Pileser did not reappear in Palestine. In B.C. 727 he died, and was succeeded by another usurper (or at least by a stranger) of the name of Shalmaneser. Though his power had been completely broken, Pekah still reigned in Israel, and Shalmaneser organized another expedition against him. Hoshea seems to have remained at the head of a party favourable to the Assyrians. Shalmaneser, however, was assassinated by yet another usurper of the Assyrian crown, who assumed the name of Sargon. The fall of Samaria followed immediately afterwards, and is thus described by Sargon:—

"In the beginning of my reign the city of Samaria I besieged, I captured; 27,280 of its inhabitants I carried away: 50 chariots in the midst of them I collected, and the rest of their goods I seized; I set my governor over them and laid upon them the tribute of the former king."

The date is B.C. 722, the twelfth year of Ahaz. Though no name is mentioned it seems probable that this is the account of the final overthrow of Pekah by the Assyrians, and of the appointment of Hoshea as the Assyrian governor of Samaria in his place. Yet even now the twenty years of Pekah's reign are not quite complete, and since there is no mention here of his being put to death, it is possible that he still maintained a precarious existence for two years before being finally murdered by Hoshea in B.C. 720. Three years later Ahaz died, and was succeeded by his son Hezekiah (B.C. 717).

But Assyrian rapacity was soon to goad even the unfortunate Hoshea into resistance. We have seen him as the mere tool of Tiglath-Pileser, Shalmaneser, and Sargon. He had at length been made king, or "governor," in Samaria; but he was weighed down with an annual tribute (2 Kings xvii. 4) that the land was no longer able to bear. Just at that time, however, a new power arose, from which help was eagerly expected. The Egyptian monarchy had seen its power wane and decay. Now there appeared from

the south an Ethiopian conqueror, called So in our Bibles, Segor or Sua in the Septuagint, Sebichus in Manetho, and Shabak on the monuments (B.C. 715). He extended his empire northward even more rapidly and successfully than Tiglath-Pileser had extended his westward. At length the two empires each touched the Mediterranean, and had a short common frontier on the narrow Isthmus of Suez. To Hoshea the new conqueror appeared as a Heaven-sent deliverer. The past memories of Egyptian bondage were as nothing compared with the present horrors of Assyrian vassalage. Other nations looked for relief to the same quarter. Hoshea therefore stopped his tribute to Assyria, and bade defiance to Sargon. The challenge was eagerly accepted. The King of Assyria marched into the land and threw Hoshea into prison (2 Kings xvii. 4): his forces covered the whole land: for three years the capital maintained a hopeless struggle: then it fell; and the whole of Israel was transported to Assyria. The nation of Israel existed no more (B.C. 711).

The kingdom of Judah survived the fall of her sister for 124 years. It has been suggested that Jerusalem herself was captured by Sargon on the occasion of this expedition in B.C. 711, though Hezekiah was not deposed. It is difficult however to find any conclusive evidence to this effect in either the Hebrew or Assyrian records, and more probably

the natural strength of the city enabled her to resist the invader even when her allies were falling in rapid succession before him.

Sargon reigned six years longer and was succeeded by his son Sennacherib: in Egypt Shabak was succeeded by Tehrak, called also Tirhakah or Tearcus: at Babylon we find a man of unusual ability and enterprise, by name Merodach-Baladan, the most persistent enemy Assyria ever had. Immediately on the death of Shalmaneser Merodach-Baladan had raised the standard of revolt in Babylon and in spite of Sargon's strenuous attempts to crush him, he had maintained his independence for eleven years. In B.C. 710 Sargon felt at length that his Syrian conquests were secure, and turning his whole force on Babylon succeeded in capturing the city. Merodach-Baladan retreated to Beth-Yagina, where he was taken prisoner, and sent in chains to Nineveh. After Sargon's death he succeeded in escaping, and in B.C. 703 we find him again at Babylon, and again an independent prince.

This is the famous fourteenth year of Hezekiah. Hezekiah had just recovered from a dangerous illness and received an embassy from Merodach-Baladan, ostensibly for the purpose of congratulating him on his recovery, but in reality to cement an alliance against Assyria for the purpose of attacking Sennacherib on both sides. Tirhakah also joined the

alliance. The alliance was a formidable one, but the prompt and decisive action of the Assyrians succeeded in crushing it in detail. Almost before the Egyptian army was ready to take the field on the west, Sennacherib inflicted a defeat on Merodach-Baladan at the battle of Kis (B.C. 703), and after a brief independence of nine months Babylon was again reduced to subjection. Sennacherib was now free to turn his attention to Palestine. Tirhakah was defeated at Eltekeh; Judah was completely overrun; and Hezekiah blockaded in Jerusalem. Then a terrible and mysterious disaster befell the Assyrian army. Sennacherib was forced to retreat with his schemes of conquest all unfulfilled. With the remnants of his once irresistible army he returned to Assyria.

The irregularity of the succession in Israel makes it difficult to tabulate the chronology of this period, but the following table affords a fair comparison between the received chronology and the revised chronology here advocated:

	Year of the Revolt		Years B.C.		
Judah	Received Chron.	Revised Chron.	Received Chron.	Revised Chron.	Israel
[Uzziah]	203	179	773	754	Zechariah
	204	180	772	753	Shallum
	204	180	772	753	Menahem
Uzziah / Jotham	211	183	765	750	
	215	191	761	742	Pekahiah

	Year of the Revolt		Years B.C.		
JUDAH	Received Chron.	Revised Chron.	Received Chron.	Revised Chron.	ISRAEL
	217	193	759	740	Pekah
Jotham	218	194	758	739	
Ahaz	234	199	742	734	
	237	211	739	722	Anarchy?
	246	213	730	720	Hoshea
Hezekiah	249	216	727	717	
	255	222	721	711	Fall of Samaria

The chronological material at our disposal for dealing with the Kings of Judah after the fall of Samaria is exhibited in the following table:—

King's name	Years of his reign	Age at his accession	Notes
Hezekiah	29	25[a]	[a] See p. 8
Manasseh	55	12	
Amon	2	22	
Josiah	31	8	
Jehoahaz	(3 months)	23	
Jehoiakim	11	25	
Jehoiachin or Jeconiah	(3 months, 10 days)	18[b]	[b] See p. 4
Zedekiah	11	21	

It will be observed that we have only one line of kings to deal with instead of two, so that to some extent the chronology becomes as simple as that of the first period. On the other hand we lose an ever

present test of our accuracy, and we miss some of those fascinating difficulties that make the chronology of the contemporary kings so interesting. The discovery of the Babylonian inscriptions, however, will enable us to determine the dates with all but infallible certainty. It is curious to observe that as the received chronology formerly gave the true year of the revolt for more than a century (p. 39) and fell into a uniform error of 43 years in stating the date B.C., so now for the last century it is only one year wrong in the account B.C., but falls into an error of 42 years in calculating the year of the revolt.

Hezekiah's reign began in B.C. 717. His sixth year was B.C. 711, the fourteenth B.C. 703, and his twenty-ninth and last year B.C. 688. It will not do, however, to employ dead reckoning from this point onward, as there is a temptation to do in the absence of a contemporary King of Israel, or we shall find ourselves several years wrong before we reach the end of the period. Besides as Hezekiah was about 54 at his death, and Manasseh only 12 at his accession, one is inclined to suspect the possibility of a co-regency between them; but we have nothing yet to guide us as to the length of such a co-regency, if it ever existed.

Babylonian chronology, however, enables us to calculate the date of Manasseh by reckoning backwards from the accession of Nebuchadrezzar, which

occurred early in the year B.C. 605. This year was accordingly reckoned the first of Nebuchadrezzar by the Jews; according to the Babylonian reckoning his first year was B.C. 604. Now the contemporary prophet Jeremiah enables us to translate the Babylonian chronology into the years of the Jewish kings. Thus in Jer. xxv. 1 we read that the word of Jehovah came to him in the fourth year of Jehoiakim king of Judah: "the same was the first year of Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon." Again we read in Jer. xlvi. 2, "Concerning the army of Pharaoh-Neco king of Egypt, which was by the river Euphrates in Carchemish, which Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon smote in the fourth year of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah, king of Judah." According to a fragment of Berosus the battle of Carchemish was fought after the death of Nabopolassar, but before the news of that death had reached Nebuchadrezzar. This again would be very early in the year (counting from Abib or Nisan) B.C. 605, and the first year of Jehoiakim must have been B.C. 608.

Now Jeremiah, whose chronological statements are very precise, reckons twenty-three years, probably counting inclusively, from the thirteenth of Josiah to the ninth of Jehoiakim (Jer. xxv. 3). This would make the thirteenth of Josiah B.C. 627, or possibly 628. Again as Jehoiakim's first year was B.C. 608, it is probable that the thirty-first, and last, of Josiah

was B.C. 609, which would again give us B.C. 627 (or just possibly 626) for his thirteenth year, the two computations together definitely fixing B.C. 627 for the thirteenth year and B.C. 639 for the first. The second and last year of Amon would probably be the year before this (B.C. 640), and as there is hardly room for a co-regency here, in view of the short reign of Amon and the tender years of Josiah, the first year of Amon would be B.C. 641. If there were any co-regency between Amon and Manasseh, of which there is no evidence, it must in any case have been extremely short, so that we may date the first year of Manasseh B.C. 696. He may have been associated with his father Hezekiah some time in the previous year, B.C. 697.

Manasseh is the only king of Judah whose age was at all advanced at the birth of his son and successor. But in this case, as shewn on p. 10, we can prove that his successor was not the eldest but a younger son. Manasseh's captivity cannot be dated later than B.C. 668, for we read in 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11 that the captains of the host of the King of Assyria carried him to Babylon. Now the crowns of Assyria and Babylon were separated on the death of Esar-haddon in B.C. 668, so that Manasseh's captivity must be dated earlier than this. On the other hand Amon ascended the throne in B.C. 642 (B.C. 641 being counted his first year) and was apparently born in B.C. 664.

Again, as it was only before his captivity that Manasseh worshipped strange gods, the son whom he made to pass through the fire must have been older than Amon. What became of this elder son we have no means of knowing.

The chronology seems therefore to be established as far as the reign of Jehoiakim. His eleventh and last year was B.C. 598. The captivity of Jehoiachin, his successor, is dated in 2 Kings xxiv. 12 the eighth year of Nebuchadrezzar, and in Jeremiah lii. 28 the seventh year of Nebuchadrezzar. The year which corresponds to the seventh or eighth year of Nebuchadrezzar, according as we adopt the Babylonian or Jewish reckoning, is B.C. 598. The apparent discrepancy between them is due to the fact that the year B.C. 605, which falls almost entirely in Nebuchadrezzar's reign and not Nabopolassar's, was to the Jews "the first of Nebuchadrezzar." To the Babylonians eleven months of the year were only "The beginning of Nebuchadrezzar's reign": his "first year" was B.C. 604. In any case B.C. 598 is both the last of Jehoiakim and also includes the captivity of Jehoiachin. Jehoiachin's reign therefore was confined to this year, which must also be the date of Zedekiah's accession. The first year of Zedekiah is B.C. 597, and the eleventh B.C. 587. This was reckoned as the eighteenth of Nebuchadrezzar by the Babylonians (Jer. lii. 29), and as the nineteenth by the Jews (2 Kings xxv. 8; Jer. lii. 12).

As Jehoiachin was still alive, though in captivity, the Jews at Babylon continued to reckon the date by his reign, marking their dates one higher than those of the Jews who were left at Jerusalem and reckoned by Zedekiah's reign. Thus the twelfth year of Jehoiachin's captivity corresponds to the eleventh year of Zedekiah's reign (Ezekiel xxxiii. 21). Jehoiachin was released by Evil-Merodach in the 37th year of his captivity (B.C. 562). As Nebuchadrezzar reigned 43 years, this would be "the beginning of Evil-Merodach's reign." It is the last we hear of the Hebrew monarchy.

The following table affords a comparison between the old received chronology and the revised chronology for this period :—

	Year of the Revolt		Years B.C.	
	Received Chron.	Revised Chron.	Received Chron.	Revised Chron.
Hezekiah } Manasseh }	—	236	—	697
Manasseh	278	245	698	688
Amon	333	291	643	642
Josiah	335	293	641	640
Jehoahaz	366	324	610	609
Jehoiakim	366	324	610	609
Jehoiachin	377	335	599	598
Zedekiah	377	335	599	598
Fall of Jerusalem	388	346	588	587

THE FALL OF SAMARIA.

THE chronology that is here proposed, and in some cases also the interpretation of Assyrian monuments, differs materially from that accepted by competent scholars. In particular the date of the fall of Samaria, which is here treated as occurring in B.C. 711, has long been fixed for B.C. 722. Respect for the names of historians and chronologers who have accepted this date obliges me to discuss it at some length.

Now these chronologers and historians will probably admit, and therefore I do them no wrong in suggesting, that their dates are completely out of harmony with the Hebrew dates presented in our Bible. For if we thrust the date of the fall of Samaria back to B.C. 722, not only is Pekah's reign cut short beyond all reason, but we lose the synchronism between Israelite and Jewish chronology, according to which the fall of Samaria occurred in the sixth year of Hezekiah. To remedy this the reign of Hezekiah must also be thrust ten or eleven years back, but then we lose the synchronism between the fourteenth year of his reign and the war with

Sennacherib: and not only so but we are obliged to put his birth in the days of his father's infancy. As a compromise between these alternatives we may put the accession of Hezekiah in B.C. 725. Then we have a sort of symmetry, though not a perfect one, between his reign and Hoshea's: his birth also is somewhat improved since it falls in his father's childhood instead of his babyhood: finally we recover a sort of clumsy synchronism in the matter of his fourteenth year, for it coincides with the war with Sargon, if not with Sennacherib, and with another of Merodach-Baladan's many wars with Assyria. It is true that Sargon's army was not mysteriously destroyed as Sennacherib's was, but the advantage of the living over the dead is that they may (and do) attribute to the Jewish writer a confusion between the two expeditions that is really their own. It is clear then that, on the authority of the Hebrew records, the earlier date for the fall of Samaria must be entirely discredited.

The Egyptian evidence on the subject is not absolutely decisive, but such weight as it has is entirely in favour of the date proposed here. There can be no reasonable doubt but that So, the ally of Hoshea, is identical with the Ethiopian conqueror Shabak, and not with Piankhi or Bekenranf. Now the date of Shabak cannot be fixed with certainty, but all the evidence available points to a date of about B.C. 718—714. In this case he clearly cannot have

allied himself with Hoshea so early as B.C. 725 (the date of Hoshea's revolt according to the usual chronology), and his appearance would exactly coincide with the date of Hoshea's revolt that is advocated here. It is quite true that some Egyptologists have sought to thrust the date of Shabak as far back as B.C. 725, or even earlier, but as this has only been done out of deference to the assumed interpretation of the Assyrian monuments, it clearly has no independent value as evidence from Egyptian sources. Moreover the attempt has been abandoned by Prof. Petrie in his recently published history, and he can only suggest that if B.C. 725 is the date, Shabak must have been acting as regent for Kashta or Piankhi.

Hebrew evidence thus indicates that the kingdom of Israel existed to a later date than B.C. 722: Egyptian evidence indicates that the alliance between Hoshea and So cannot have been so early as this: but the final decision of the question does not rest with the Hebrew or Egyptian evidence, but with that of the Assyrian monuments. We have to deal with two expeditions of Sargon against Palestine. Sargon's description of the earlier of these expeditions may be quoted once more:

> In the beginning of my reign [*i.e.* B.C. 722] the city of Samaria I besieged, I captured; 27,280 of its inhabitants I carried away; 50 chariots in the midst of them I collected, and the rest of their goods I seized; I set my governor over them and laid upon them the tribute of the former king.

It should be abundantly clear that this is not the capture of Samaria described in 2 Kings xvii. Before her fall Israel had nerved herself for a final and desperate resistance: the nation was on its mettle, and had no choice except between successful revolt and complete annihilation. The end was complete annihilation. For three years the King of Assyria was held at bay, but in the end Samaria fell and the whole land was depopulated.

Now in the case of the capture described by Sargon the number of captives was only 27,280: of whom possibly six or seven thousand were capable of bearing arms. The number of chariots was only fifty. There was therefore insufficient force to man the walls of Samaria, and it cannot be supposed that with such meagre forces, so inefficiently equipped, Hoshea would ever dare to take up arms against Assyria: nor if he did, could Samaria by any possibility have resisted for three years. Nor can it be supposed that either Israel, or even Samaria, had such a tiny population as 27,280, when Sennacherib's captives from Judah numbered 200,150; and if Sargon's captives were not more numerous, it is clear that the vast majority of the Israelites must have been left in their own country. Yet when Samaria finally fell the transportation of the Israelites was complete; so much so that Israel could be spoken of as "blotted out." The fact that a single priest had to be brought

from captivity in order to instruct the new settlers in the worship of Jehovah shews how complete the depopulation had been. And further, if this inscription describes the ultimate fall of Samaria, how are we to describe the reference to the new governor and the tribute? Estimates of the value of filthy lucre will vary considerably, and Sargon evidently considered it important enough to serve as a climax to his military triumphs. Now when the Israelites were carried away who was to pay this tribute? It is true that other nations (mostly from Babylonia, which was conquered in B.C. 710) were subsequently settled on the soil once occupied by Israel, but for a time the country lay waste, and was abandoned to the wild beasts; so that the lions, whose growth had been kept in check while the land was inhabited, were allowed to multiply apace. It is clear therefore that the identification of this capture of Samaria described by Sargon with that described in 2 Kings xvii. breaks down in every particular. The two captures are quite distinct. In all probability the unnamed king whom Sargon dethroned was Pekah. Whether the "governor" appointed to take his place and levy the tribute was Hoshea or an Assyrian general cannot be said.

Eleven years later (B.C. 711) we find Sargon at the head of another expedition against Palestine. The account of the war is not quite complete, and it

is impossible to follow the movements with perfect accuracy. But the account of the insurrection is very clear:

> The people of the Philistines, Judah, Edom, the Moabites, the dwellers by the sea, who owed tribute and presents to Assur my lord, plotted rebellion, men of insolence: to rebel against me they carried their bribes to Pharaoh king of Egypt, a prince who could not save them, and sent him homage.

Compare this with the account given in 2 Kings xvii. 4:

> And the king of Assyria found conspiracy in Hoshea; for he had sent messengers to So king of Egypt and offered no present to the king of Assyria, as he had done year by year: therefore the king of Assyria shut him up and bound him in prison.

It seems impossible that anyone should regard these as descriptions of two distinct events. They harmonize perfectly as the Assyrian and Hebrew accounts of the same conspiracy and rebellion, and its suppression. It will be noticed, however, that the Israelites are not mentioned by name: they are probably included under the title of "dwellers by the sea." The time had not yet come when the Assyrian arms were to menace Egypt herself: Sargon was content for the present to maintain the Assyrian supremacy in lands already subjugated, and the Hittites and Philistines were the most dangerous of the rebel nations. In spite of the determined resistance offered by Samaria, the annihilation of Israel was comparatively simple.

Indeed Hoshea's weakness becomes abundantly manifest when we notice that Sargon was able to seize and imprison him first, and afterwards ravage his country and take his capital (2 Kings xvii. 4, 5). Probably little weight is due to the tradition that connects the name of Shalmaneser with the fall of Samaria (2 Kings xviii. 9; 9 *Antiq.* xiv. 1). Sargon was one of the greatest of Assyrian conquerors: yet by the irony of fate his name had almost perished: he is unknown to the Greek historians; the glory of his conquests was divided between his predecessor Shalmaneser and his son Sennacherib: but for a casual reference by Isaiah (xx. 1) he would have been entirely forgotten; and even in the case of Isaiah's reference, critics disputed whether they should identify Sargon with Sennacherib or Shalmaneser. Now in the official account of the fall of Samaria (2 Kings xvii. 4–6) the name of the Assyrian king is not mentioned. Hoshea had been rightly described as the servant of Shalmaneser (2 Kings xvii. 3), just as he had previously been Tiglath-Pileser's nominee for the crown. Hence when Sargon's name came to be forgotten, Shalmaneser was regarded as the captor of Samaria. But whichever date for the fall of Samaria be accepted, it is certain that the honour of its capture really rests with Sargon. On all grounds therefore, whether of Jewish, Israelite, Egyptian, or Assyrian chronology, it is clear that the true

date of the fall of Samaria is B.C. 711 and not B.C. 722 as has so long been assumed. The rectification of this date is of the utmost importance as giving us a clear and intelligible account of the sequence of events during this period, and as re-establishing the authority of the recorded Hebrew numbers.

The dates here proposed are now all exhibited together.

Kings of Judah	Year of the Revolt	Years B.C.	Kings of Israel
Rehoboam	1	932	Jeroboam
Abijah	18	915	
Asa	20	913	
	22	911	Nadab
	23	910	Baasha
	46	887	Elah
	47	886	Zimri
	47	886	Omri
	58	875	Ahab
Jehoshaphat	62	871	
	79	854	Ahaziah
	80	853	Joram
Jehoshaphat } Jehoram }	84	849	
Jehoram	87	846	
Ahaziah	91	842	
Athaliah	91	842	Jehu
Jehoash	97	836	
	118	815	Jehoahaz
	134	799	Joash
Amaziah	136	797	
	139	794	{ Joash { Jeroboam

Kings of Judah	Year of the Revolt	Years B.C.	Kings of Israel
Amaziah } Azariah }	142	791	
	150	783	Jeroboam
Azariah } or Uzziah }	165	768	
	179	754	Zechariah
	180	753	Shallum
	180	753	Menahem
Azariah } Jotham }	183	750	
	191	742	Pekahiah
	193	740	Pekah
Jotham	194	739	
Ahaz	199	734	
	211	722	[Sargon's Governor]
	213	720	Hoshea
Hezekiah	216	717	
	222	711	Fall of Samaria
Hezekiah } Manasseh }	236	697	
Manasseh	245	688	
Amon	291	642	
Josiah	293	640	
Jehoahaz	324	609	
Jehoiakim	324	609	
Jehoiachin	335	598	
Zedekiah	335	598	
Fall of Jerusalem }	346	587	

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE JUDGES.

In the preceding pages I have endeavoured to treat the chronology of the kings exhaustively, because there is good reason to hope that by so doing, and only by so doing, we may arrive in time at a perfect solution of the problem before us. The chronological records for the period of the Judges are not so complete as to promise the easy attainment of any such result. Nor are we yet permitted to feel such confidence, as we do in the case of the kings, that where our chronology is not absolutely correct it is at least within a very few years of being so. At the same time it becomes our duty as soon as the one period is settled to our satisfaction to proceed further and investigate the period lying immediately before it.

In dealing with the chronology of this period it is usual to extend it for a few years at either end, so that our starting point becomes the Exodus from Egypt and our terminus the foundation of Solomon's

Temple. In our present Hebrew Bibles the length of this extended period is given (1 Kings vi. 1) as 480 years. But such a date cannot be regarded as conclusive evidence, and that for several reasons. The Hebrews as we know had no consecutive chronological reckoning even in the time of the kings, nor indeed until the days of the Maccabees. It is therefore highly improbable that they had any such record in the comparatively unsettled time of the Judges, so that the date given must stand at the best as the computation of a later historian and not as an original record. Moreover it was unknown to Josephus, who gives 592 years (8 *Antiq.* iii. 1) as the length of the period, and apparently to St Paul also, who, if the reading be correct (Acts xiii. 20), gives 450 from the conquest of Canaan to Samuel, or a total nearly the same as that of Josephus. The presence of a various reading (440th year) in the Septuagint Version of 1 Kings vi. is of less importance: for if the reading is in no case authoritative, it is hardly necessary for the chronologer to determine which reading is genuine.

But if the Hebrews had no consecutive chronological reckoning, yet it was seen in our discussion of the chronology of the kings, how careful and precise their records were in dealing with shorter periods. Exactly the same precision is found in recording the length of short periods during the time of the

Judges, and by the addition of these periods we may possibly approximate to the true chronology, though unfortunately we cannot check our results by continual reference to contemporary events in a sister nation.

The following table will afford the basis of our chronology:

Moses	40 years	
Joshua	25[a]	[a] Josephus
The Elders who survived Joshua	—[b]	[b] Not stated
Cushan-Rishathaim, oppressor ...	8	
Othniel, deliverer	—	
The land had rest	40	
Eglon, oppressor	18	
Ehud, deliverer	—	
The land had rest	80	
The Philistines	—	
Shamgar, deliverer	—	
Jabin, oppressor	20	
Barak, deliverer	—	
The land had rest	40	
The Midianites	7	
Gideon, deliverer	—	
The land had rest	40	
Abimelech	3	
Tola, judge	23	
Jair, judge	22	
The Ammonites and Philistines	18	
Jephthah defeats the Ammonites	—	
Jephthah, judge	6	
Ibzan, judge	7	
Elon, judge	10	
Abdon, judge	8	

The Philistines	40 years	
Samson, "in the days of the Philistines"	20	
Eli, high priest and judge ...	40	
Samuel	11, 12[a]	[a] *vide infra*
Saul, king	2[b]	[b] 20, Josephus
David, king	40	[c] To the foundation
Solomon	3[c]	of the Temple

The total comes to 572 years, with a few intervals whose exact length is not stated. Allowing for the increased reign assigned to Saul this is virtually the chronology adopted by Josephus. But an examination of the various items on the list will soon convince us that any system of dead reckoning is entirely unsuitable. The constant repetition of the number forty has long been recognised as an artificial item, whose presence throws suspicion on the total. But there are graver reasons than this for distrusting the total of the various items, and for seeking a rearrangement of the list more likely to lead us to the true chronology.

It is important at this point that we should form a clear conception of the problem that lies before us. As it is usually presented to us, the period is filled by an almost perfect alternation of Judges and "servitudes." The total length of the servitudes is 111 years, and their omission would seem to offer an easy means of reconciling the Massoretic total (480 years) with that of Josephus (592 years). This device is actually put into practice by the Modern

Jews, but it is much to be feared that the ancient Jews had a harder task in expelling the invader from their country than their descendants in expunging him from the chronology.

But the whole method of treating the judges as though they were a line of kings and the servitudes as interregna separating them, is thoroughly unsatisfactory, and probably it no longer commends itself to students of Jewish history. It has to be remembered that many of the servitudes were only partial, and each so-called judge was, in the earlier days at least, merely a deliverer from the oppressor. Presumably his influence would be felt in the district or among the tribes whom he had delivered. Other tribes, as we see from the fifth chapter, were content to ignore oppressor and deliverer alike, and continued undisturbed in their ordinary occupations. And here we notice a distinction that has to be drawn between the earlier and the later judges. Until the time of Gideon the normal expression after each deliverance is, "and the land had rest for forty years." There is clearly no mention, and apparently no suggestion, of any established form of government. Gideon, however, was invited to reign over the country, and though he declined the offer himself, yet his illegitimate son Abimelech "was prince over Israel three years." After Abimelech Tola "judged Israel twenty and three years," and this is the form of expression

adopted with each of Tola's successors. Coincidently with this change of expression the vague number forty disappears, and we seem to have a fairly exact chronology, and at least some recognised authority vesting in the persons of consecutive judges till the establishment of Saul's kingdom.

As in the case of the kings it will be convenient to subdivide the whole period into a number of shorter periods, and to examine each of them in detail. The first of these will comprise the leadership of Moses, to whom forty years are assigned, and Joshua, to whom Josephus allots twenty-five years, and possibly also "the elders who survived Joshua."

It is impossible to feel sure of the chronology of this period. The life of Moses, extending to 120 years and made up of three separate periods of forty years each, is evidently artificial. Joshua's life extends to 110 years, and it is difficult to avoid the feeling that scientific chronology can hardly begin till the ordinary range of human life has fallen below the century. At the same time a period of 65 years for Moses and Joshua is by no means unreasonable. It would mean 47 years for Joshua's military activity, and in the absence of further evidence it will continue to be accepted. Of the elders who survived Joshua we know nothing. The short period of their influence is possibly included in the chronology either of this or of the following period.

The second period extends from Joshua to Gideon. It is perhaps the most unsettled period in all Jewish history, when there was no king in the land and every man did that which was right in his own eyes. However the semblance of a chronology can be traced through it, as shewn in the table on pp. 79, 80. It will be seen that there is here an unbroken alternation of servitude and judge, of oppressor and deliverer. It will also be observed that the period of rest is invariably given as forty years, except when Ehud and Shamgar combine to take a double allowance of eighty years. The lengths of the servitudes on the other hand are stated with precision, and there is no reason to suppose that the numbers given are anything but correct. Altogether we seem to have two hundred years of supposed judicial government, and fifty-three years of servitude. The chronologer will do well to pay more attention to the smaller of these numbers than to the larger.

Misconception as to the nature of a servitude is as common as the misconception of the judge's actual position in Israel that has already been dealt with. Chronologers have been in the habit of treating the servitudes very much as if they represented established foreign governments. It need hardly be said that such a suggestion has very little to recommend it. An irregular series of raids or forays is all we are to expect. The series terminates in the defeat or death

of the principal oppressor, and "the land has rest." The chronological points therefore are simply a number of battles. There is no reign of a king or a judge to consider. The years assigned to the servitude simply represent the lengths of time elapsing between two consecutive deliverances. No time at all is assigned to the judge, and except in the case of Deborah, who is said to have judged Israel during the Canaanite servitude, there is no suggestion even of the exercise of judicial or executive authority.

Recognising the real nature of the occurrences described as well as their sequence, the true chronology of this period is soon evolved. The death of Joshua is probably the starting point, and our series of deliverances carry us on from there to the re-establishment of something like central government under Gideon.

	Years later
The Death of Joshua	—
Othniel 'prevailed against' Cushan-Rishathaim	8
Ehud murdered Eglon and 'smote' Moab ...	18
Shamgar 'smote' the Philistines	—
Barak 'destroyed' Jabin	20
Gideon 'discomfited' the Midianites	7
	53

With Gideon this period closes and we have something approximating to a settled order and government for many years after. How long Gideon

himself governed Israel we are unable to say. The recurrence (for the last time) of the phrase "The land had rest forty years" forbids us to speak with too great a show of precision. In any case considerably more than 40 years elapsed before the next foreign invasion. From Gideon's death, however, the succession is traced with perfect clearness for nearly a century. True, it is only dead reckoning and we have no scope for the niceties of chronological adjustment, but the items themselves seem to leave little room for serious error.

Abimelech	3 years
Tola	23
Jair	22
The Ammonite servitude ...	18
Jephthah	6
Ibzan	7
Elon	10
Abdon...	8
	97

It should be noticed how greatly the language used in writing the history of this period differs from that used in describing the period before Gideon. These are settled and authoritative judges, and are so described. There is no longer any mention of saving Israel or giving the land rest, but it is said of each one that he judged Israel for a definite number of years. The chronologer feels comparatively firm ground under his feet, and as the judges appear to have definite government assigned to them, so the

Ammonite servitude comes in as a definite interruption of that government.

In Judges x. 7 we read that the Philistines were associated with the Ammonites in the oppression of Israel. Only the Ammonites were defeated by Jephthah the Gileadite: the Philistines continued this oppression in the south-west for several years longer. In Jud. xiii. 1 the total length of the Philistine servitude is given as 40 years. If this number could be regarded as exact it would bring us to the days of Elon or Abdon. In point of fact Philistinian aggression continued to a much later date than this, and the state of subjection that is subsequently described in 1 Sam. xiii. 19–22 suggests that at times the oppression must have been very severe indeed. Contemporaneously with the Philistine servitude (Judges xv. 20), and therefore not affecting the chronology, we have Samson, a hero who recalls the older type of deliverer, and apparently Eli also, who judged Israel during the term of his high-priesthood.

The government of Samuel is now all that separates us from the establishment of the kingdom. Its duration is not directly stated, but it may be calculated in two ways, both of which lead to nearly the same result. Josephus reckoned 32 years from the death of Eli to that of Saul. As he assigned Saul an exaggerated reign of twenty years instead of two, this would leave twelve for Samuel. The Biblical argument is of a different character, and in

the result it approaches Josephus' estimate so closely that we can have little doubt of its correctness. In 1 Sam. vii. 2 we read, "It came to pass, from the day that the ark abode in Kiriath-jearim, that the time was long, for it was twenty years." Now the ark was brought up from Kiriath-jearim by David, in the eighth year of his reign, or soon after. Allowing two years for Saul's reign (1 Sam. xiii. 1) the duration of Samuel's government will come out as ten years. To this must be added the seven months that the ark was in the land of the Philistines (1 Sam. vi. 1) and a short time for its stay at Beth-shemesh before being brought to Kiriath-jearim, so that eleven years would appear to be the nearest approximation to the length of Samuel's government. The coincidence with Josephus is too close and too striking for us to have any hesitation in accepting this conclusion.

The total length of time therefore from the Exodus to the Accession of Saul would seem from the Hebrew records to be about

$$65 + 53 + x + 97 + 11 = 226 + x \text{ years.}$$

The x represents the unknown length of Gideon's rule. The first term is probably overstated: the second may possibly be somewhat understated. The fourth may be either overstated or understated: the Hebrew method of counting inclusively suggests the former, but it is counterbalanced by the allowance that must be made, where there is no hereditary or automatic

succession, for electoral intervals between the judges. The last term is apparently precise, but it is impossible to say whether Samuel was separated from Abdon by any short interval, or whether they overlapped. It will be seen therefore that there are many elements of uncertainty in our reckoning. But to some extent, being in opposite directions, they cancel one another, and the total is not likely to be very far wrong. As the date of Saul's accession may be taken as B.C. 1014, the Exodus is clearly thrown back to the middle of the thirteenth century. It remains to see how far such a date is in agreement with the Egyptian records.

Before turning to these however it is to be observed that the period allowed here for the interval between the Exodus and the monarchy is some 200 or 300 years less than has generally been allotted to it. But though this reduction is so large, it is no more than is absolutely required unless we are prepared to set all the ordinary conditions of human life at defiance. Two important genealogies among others have been preserved in the opening chapters of the First Book of the Chronicles :

The Royal Descent. Judah, Perez, Hezron, Ram, Amminadab, Nahshon, Salma, Boaz, Obed, Jesse, David. Nahshon was the brother-in-law of Aaron, so that David belonged to the fifth generation after the Exodus.

The High-Priestly Descent. Levi, Kohath, Amram, Aaron, Eleazar, Phinehas, Abishua, Bukki, Uzzi, Zera-

hiah, Meraioth, Amariah, Ahitub, Zadok. The generations here are considerably shorter than in the former case, owing to the fact that this line is virtually confined to the eldest sons. Zadok, the contemporary of David and Solomon, appears as the tenth from Aaron.

The second of these genealogies is specially important. As it is necessarily confined to the case of eldest surviving sons, and must be regarded as complete, unless it is supposed that the record of the High-Priesthood perished, we can almost certainly date Zadok, the tenth from Aaron (B.C. 972) somewhere between 200 and 300 years after the Exodus. In the case of the royal descent the line of eldest sons was not maintained, so that the generations are much longer. But at the utmost the birth of David (B.C. *circa* 1042) can hardly be dated much more than 200 years after the Exodus. The reckoning by generations is necessarily vague and deficient in many respects. But, as we saw in the case of the kings, it has the advantage of absolutely excluding any chronological system that is either so short or so long as to be at variance with the laws of nature. The genealogies seem to declare themselves, however, on the side of the chronology that is advocated here, and point once more towards the middle of the thirteenth century as the probable date of the Exodus. That date we shall proceed to examine more closely in the following chapter.

THE DATE OF THE EXODUS.

THE Exodus is an event in Egyptian history as well as in Jewish, and fortunately it is possible to determine its date much more accurately from Egyptian sources than the unsupplemented Jewish records would enable us to do. Egyptian chronology, when spread over long periods, depends on the Sothic Cycle and on the incidence of the first of Thoth or the Egyptian new year. Since the Egyptian Calendar had an unvarying year of 365 days, it necessarily fell short of the true astronomical year, and lost, roughly, a day in every four years. The consequence was that a whole year was dropped in 1460 years, a loss that was well known to the Egyptians themselves though they never regarded it as worth their while to take any steps to make it good. The relation of the Calendar to the true astronomical year was fixed by direct observation of the heliacal rising of Sothis or Sirius, the Dog-star.

Since the knowledge of popular observational astronomy is less general now than it was in ancient

or mediaeval days, it may be necessary to tender some explanation of the nature of the observation required, so that its chronological significance may be duly appreciated. We are familiar with the regular rising and of the setting of the stars every day or every night of the year. As the result of the earth's annual revolution round the sun as well as its daily revolution on its own axis, the stars rise and set in each year once more often than the sun does itself. Consequently on each night of the year they are seen to rise or set about four minutes earlier than on the previous night, and there are some days, or weeks, or even months in the year in which each star, save the circumpolar stars, becomes lost in the sun's rays and is invisible altogether. Now the ancients, in Greece and elsewhere as well as in Egypt, were in the habit of taking note not only of the daily rising and setting of the stars on the horizon, but also of their annual emergence from the solar radiance and of their subsequent redisappearance therein. All the most important stars were so observed, but for our present purpose it will be sufficient to take the case of Sirius, the Dog-star, which is the brightest of all. In June and in the early days of July Sirius is totally invisible in Egypt. The hours it spends above the horizon are those of daylight, and the star is unseen. But towards the end of July it may be glimpsed for a few minutes in the eastern twilight immediately before sunrise. This is the

star's annual heliacal rising. The next morning it may be seen four minutes earlier, and the day after four minutes earlier still. At last it can be seen nearly the whole night through. Then it begins to disappear. It sets long before sunrise. It can be seen in the evening only, and not at midnight. One night, in May, it can be seen for a moment only in the glow of the western twilight at sunset. The next night it cannot be seen at all. It is the heliacal setting, and Sirius will be unknown till it rises again in July.

Now as the Egyptian calendar year contained 365 days instead of $365\frac{1}{4}$, it is clear that at the end of the fourth year Sirius would be seen to rise heliacally a day later than before, and that at the end of 1460 years (which would make 1461 calendar years) a late generation would see the star in its old place again on the same day. We need not make any allowance for the slight discrepancy between the true sidereal year of 365·2564 days and the Julian year of 365·2500, for when the observatory extended all the way from Alexandria to Elephantine there would be no difficulty in picking up the star at some place in Egypt on the expected day. In the south it would be seen a few days earlier, and in the north not till a few days later; but this also was known and provided for, so that throughout the historical ages in Egypt the Sothic cycle was maintained at exactly 1460 astronomical or 1461 calendar years. It should be observed how-

ever, though not affecting our present calculations, that when the observation is climatic and not strictly astronomical, as for instance in records of the rise and fall of the Nile, we depend on the tropical year of 365·2422 days, and the length of this tropical (but not Sothic) cycle would be about 1507 years.

We have therefore only to find the incidence of the Sothic cycle once, and we shall have it always. Censorinus, writing from Egypt in A.D. 239, tells us that in that year the first of Thoth fell on June 25, and that a century before it had fallen on July 21, the day on which Sirius rises heliacally in Egypt. By counting backwards therefore we get for the date of the commencement of successive Sothic cycles, A.D. 139, B.C. 1322, 2782, 4242, 5702. The last of these is the earliest that is supposed by any to fall within the historical period[1].

The Sothic cycle B.C. 1322 (or 1326) began in the reign of Menophres. This king was long identified with Menephthah, the Amenophis of Josephus and the Pharaoh of the Exodus. But he is now more probably identified with Men-peh-ra, or Rameses I, the great-

[1] One hesitates to suggest a correction so obvious, but it certainly seems to me that the interval between June 25 and July 21 is 26 days, and consequently the "century" of Censorinus would actually contain 104 years. This would make the date of the commencement of the previous cycle B.C. 1326. I notice that the latest of Egyptian chronologers, though apparently accepting B.C. 1322 for the commencement of the cycle, gives B.C. 1328—1326 as the date of the short reign in which it fell.

grandfather of Menephthah. Assuming this identification to be correct, it will be possible to determine the date of the Exodus with almost perfect accuracy.

Rameses I, the founder of the nineteenth dynasty, had a short reign of only sixteen months. It is dated B.C. 1328—1326, and it is impossible that there can be any serious error in this reckoning. He was succeeded by his son Seti I. To Seti an impossibly long reign of 50 or 60 years has been assigned by some of the Greek historians, and by Josephus he is omitted altogether. The monuments of his reign are very numerous, but nothing can be traced beyond the ninth year: the fact too that the building of his great work, the Ramesseum, was left to his son, suggests that the reign was a brief one. It is probable then that this ninth year, the last of which we have any mention, was also the last of the reign.

For the date of Rameses II there is happily no doubt at all. It is determined by an astrological horoscope that is shewn by the placing of the planets to have been cast for B.C. 1318. The question as to whether this should be regarded as the date of Rameses' birth or of his accession should probably be answered in favour of the latter. As Rameses II was married in the first year of his reign, the date of his birth must apparently be thrown back to an epoch prior to the accession of his grandfather Rameses I. At that time the eighteenth dynasty occupied the

throne. Rameses I was indeed married to a princess, but as yet there was no promise of the establishment of a new dynasty. And even though there had been, Rameses II was not the eldest grandson. The birth therefore of the future prince and king was apparently a matter of small importance, and the horoscope more probably belongs to the later date of his accession, at the end of the short but brilliant reign of Seti and the inauguration of his own long and still more brilliant reign. To him a reign of 66 years is assigned, and it may be traced on the monuments step by step, and year by year, till we come to the 67th, when it closes with his death. He was succeeded by his thirteenth son Menephthah, the Pharaoh of the Exodus.

Menephthah was already past fifty when he reached the throne. That his reign went to 8 years is clear from the monumental inscriptions. Manetho indeed makes it 19½ or 20 years, but it is possible that this dates from the time when he became heir to the throne on the death of his brother Khaemuas in the 55th year of his father's reign (B.C. 1264). This will bring Manetho's reckoning into agreement with the monuments; and in any case it is necessary to shorten the chronology, since we learn that one Bakenkhonsu, the high-priest of Amen, was among the officials of Rameses II at the age of 86, and survived till the reign of Rameses III. It is hardly probable that he can have lived 118 years, but if

twelve years be taken off the reign of Menephthah, as is done in one version of Manetho, it is just possible that he may have survived as a very old man till the accession of Rameses III and the twentieth dynasty.

The dates of the earlier kings of the dynasty are repeated here:

Rameses I	1328—1326
Seti	1326—1318
Rameses II	1318—1252
Menephthah	1252—1244

The Exodus occurred in the fifth year of Menephthah's reign. It is not very surprising to find that what the Jews regarded as an escape from bitter persecution, the Egyptians were inclined to consider as the ejection of a body of undesirable alien settlers. Lower Egypt had for some time been subject to a constant pressure from the desert tribes on both her eastern and western frontiers. Sometimes there were mere raids designed to seize the rich Egyptian harvest, but the large number of women and children ultimately taken among the captives shews that considerable settlements had been effected, and both Libyan and Semitic tribes had made a permanent occupation of the country. The closing years of the reign of Rameses II had witnessed a gradual decay of Egypt's power of resistance, and in the earlier years of Menephthah the condition of the country became intolerable. The roads were unsafe: it was

dangerous even to travel on the Nile: cattle could not be pastured: the crops were pillaged as soon as they were ripe. For four years Menephthah endured this, then he determined to crush the invaders before the harvest of the fifth year could be gathered. The Egyptian army was collected on the 14th of Pauni (April 8, Julian Calendar; March 29, Gregorian Calendar), and on the 3rd of Epiphi (April 27, J. C.; April 17, G. C.) the invaders were crushed, and their irregular and undisciplined army virtually annihilated. The battle was not only a defeat but a drive, and the foreign settlers were forced eastward and westward far beyond the frontier. Libyans, Hittites, Canaanites, Philistines alike felt the force of the blow and of the vengeful pursuit. Among other items we read,

> The people of Israel is laid waste—their crops are not.

It is the one mention of Israel yet found on all the Egyptian monuments. Their crops of course are those planted in the land of Goshen and left behind unharvested in their hurried flight. The chronological coincidence is perfect, for it is the time of Passover and the month of Abib. The historical details agree with one another as the two opposite views of the same event. Josephus preserves the Jewish and Biblical account in his *Antiquities*: in his controversy with Apion he gives us Manetho's Egyptian account, and though infuriated beyond reason at Manetho's

description, he cannot do other than recognise the identity of the two stories.

It is now necessary to apply one of those delightful little rectifications that make the study of chronology so fascinating. We have seen that the great battle took place on the 3rd of Epiphi in the fifth year of Menephthah (B.C. 1248). The new year according to the Egyptian calendar would begin on the 1st of Thoth (July 1, J. C., June 21, G. C.) immediately following. But according to the ordinary Jewish and Semitic reckoning the new year had already begun with the equinoctial new moon on the 1st of Abib, and therefore the date of the Exodus in Biblical chronology must be corrected from B.C. 1248 to B.C. 1247.

And now we may see the long arm of coincidence stretching across the centuries, not indeed to give an absolute proof of the truth of our chronology, but at least to afford the strongest confirmation. The sabbatic year is one of the institutions of the Mosaic Law, and though it was not at all times very scrupulously observed, yet the computation of the week of years was carried on till the final fall of Jerusalem. The year of the Exodus must necessarily have been the first year of the first week, and we find that seventh, or sabbatic years occurred in B.C. 163, 135, 37, and A.D. 69. Reckoning backwards it is easy to see that B.C. 1241 would also be a sabbatic year, and

B.C. 1247 would consequently be, as our calculations require, the first year of the week.

Further corroboration of the chronology is perhaps to be found in the reputed ages of Aaron and Moses at the time of the Exodus (ch. vii. 7). The narrative seems to imply that Aaron must have been born shortly before, and Moses immediately after, the supposed edict for the extermination of the Jewish male infants. It is impossible to speak very confidently of all the details of the Hebrew story, but we may conclude that it was the intention of the writer to fix the date of the Exodus between 80 and 83 years after the rise of the new king, or dynasty, which knew not Joseph. According to the chronology advocated here the Exodus actually occurred 81 years after the accession of Rameses I and the nineteenth dynasty, so that the coincidence, if not quite convincing, is at least sufficiently remarkable to deserve attention.

Assuming therefore that the date of the Exodus has thus been fixed, we obtain the following scheme for the chronology of the judges and on to the foundation of Solomon's Temple. The intermediate dates of course can only be regarded as approximations to the true chronology, and one is inclined to conjecture that a slight shortening of the periods before or after Gideon, with a corresponding increase

in the length of his own authority, would not be without its advantages.

The Exodus	B.C. 1247
The Death of Moses	1207
Conquest of Canaan	1200
The Death of Joshua	1182
Othniel defeats Cushan-Rishathaim ...	1174
Ehud defeats Moab	1156
Shamgar defeats the Philistines ...	1156 ?
Barak defeats the Canaanites ...	1136
Gideon	1129
Abimelech	1122
Tola	1119
Jair	1096
The Ammonite servitude	1074
Jephthah	1056
Ibzan	1050
Elon	1043
Abdon	1033
The Death of Samson...	1034 ?
The Death of Eli	1025 ?
Samuel	1025
Saul	1014
David and Ish-Baal	1012
The Death of Ish-Baal	1010
David	1005
Solomon	972
The Foundation of the Temple ...	969

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE PRIESTLY CODE.

THE chronology of the Book of Genesis was formerly regarded as of great importance, and in the older chronological works the discussion as to the choice of the Septuagint or the Massoretic Text was sometimes the principal item of the whole treatise. Nor is this remarkable. For if the Book of Genesis gave us not only the date of our earliest civilization and of the Creation of mankind, but also the beginning of all things, the determination of its true chronology would be of supreme interest and importance. In addition to this, elaborate schemes of prophecy as to the date of Christ's second coming and of the end of the world were sometimes made to depend on the supposed date of the Creation, and thus a fictitious additional importance was given to what was already important enough. As the Massoretic readings tended to date the Creation about the fortieth century before Christ, and the Septuagint

records fifteen hundred years earlier, the difference to be dealt with was a large one, and it engrossed the attention of many generations of historians and chronologers.

The earliest authorities, such as Josephus and Eusebius, gave their preference to the Septuagint numbers, and the chronology of Eusebius was apparently generally followed throughout the middle ages. At the revival of learning, however, the Hebrew numbers of the Massoretes came into favour, and were adopted by Scaliger, Petavius, and Ussher. Later researches however seemed to shew the existence of diverse civilizations at a more remote date than the Massorete numbers allowed for the dispersion of mankind; and in order to obtain a higher antiquity for the race Jackson, Hales, and others resorted to the Septuagint, which, in spite of Clinton's belated attachment to the Hebrew, seemed to hold the field till the middle of the nineteenth century. It must be admitted now, however, that even the longest of these reckonings falls far short of any adequate representation of the real antiquity of mankind, to say nothing of the geological and astronomical ages that preceded our race's first appearance. The discussion as to the choice of the Septuagint or the Hebrew has accordingly become a barren one: neither can claim to give us the actual date of the Creation, though both may continue to contest the honour

of being the true representative of the original text of the Hexateuch.

This is not the place to discuss the various documents combined to form our present Bible. For the present purpose it will be sufficient to notice that what is called the Priestly Code contains an elaborate chronological framework, which dates the successive events not only to the exact year, but often even to the month and day. The framework is more extended in the Greek than in our present Hebrew epics, but it is just as elaborate and precise; and the Samaritan Pentateuch—which, though little thought of, may possibly be better than either—has the same chronological setting, and its own series of numbers differing both from the Hebrew and the Greek.

I believe it to be the case that wherever the length of human life is stated in the Hexateuch, from Adam to Joshua, it invariably exceeds a century. Where this is the case it is evidently impossible to frame a chronology that will suit all the requirements of history, even though we may feel ourselves treading on historical ground. The following tables however will give the chronology from the Creation to the Exodus, according to each of the three versions in which Genesis is found. The dates are simply given *Anno Mundi*, and no attempt is made to translate them into the common reckoning B.C.

		Massorete	Septuagint	Samaritan
Adam	made	1	1	1
	died	931	931	931
Seth	born	131	231	131
	died	1043	1143	1043
Enosh	born	236	436	236
	died	1141	1341	1141
Kenan	born	326	626	326
	died	1236	1536	1236
Mahalalel	born	396	796	396
	died	1291	1691	1291
Jared	born	461	961	461
	died	1423	1923	1308
Enoch	born	623	1123	523
	"God took him"	988	1488	888
Methuselah	born	688	1288	588
	died	1657	2257	1308
Lamech	born	875	1475	655
	died	1652	2228	1308
Noah	born	1057	1663	708
Shem	born	1557	1763	1208
The Flood		1657	2263	1308
Noah	died	2007	2613	1658
Shem	died	2159	2765	1810
Arpachshad	born	1659	2265	1310
	died	2097	2830	1748
Cainan	born	—	2400	—
	died	—	2860	—
Shelah	born	1694	2530	1445
	died	2127	2990	1878
Eber	born	1724	2660	1575
	died	2188	3164	1979
Peleg	born	1758	2794	1709
	died	1997	3133	1948
Reu	born	1788	2924	1839
	died	2027	3263	2078

		Massorete	Septuagint	Samaritan
Serug	born	1820	3056	1971
	died	2050	3386	2201
Nahor	born	1850	3186	2101
	died	1998	3394	2249
Terah	born	1879	3265	2180
	died	2084	3470	2325
Abram	born	1949	3335	2250
The Call of Abram		2024	3410	2325
Jacob goes into Egypt		2239	3625	2540
The Exodus		2454	3840	2755
		(or 2669)	(or 4055)	(or 2970)

The Exodus has generally been reckoned as 430 years after the Call of Abraham. If instead of this we reckon it as 430 years after Jacob's arrival in Egypt, the date assigned to it in the above table will have to be increased by 215 years, but the genealogies are against this. It seems hardly worth while to go into the question of various readings in the Septuagint. The most important would lower all dates from the birth of Lamech onwards by twenty years, so that Methuselah would survive the Flood by 14 years. It is interesting to notice that Jared, Methuselah, and Lamech would all appear from the Samaritan Pentateuch to have been actually drowned in the Flood. On the authority of the Massorete numbers such a calamity could have befallen Methuselah only. The arbitrary addition of 60 years to Terah's age at the birth of Abraham, by Ussher, Hales, Clinton and others, is unjustifiable.

As the three versions are in agreement with one

another from the birth of Terah onwards it may be more convenient to reckon the chronology of the last part of this period in terms of years before the Exodus thus :

Birth of Terah	575	Before the Exodus
Birth of Abraham	505	
Call of Abraham	430	
Birth of Ishmael	419	
Birth of Isaac	405	
Birth of Esau and Jacob ...	345	
Death of Abraham	330	
Death of Ishmael	282	
Birth of Joseph	254	
Captivity of Joseph	237	
Death of Isaac	225	
Jacob's journey into Egypt ...	215	
Death of Jacob	198	
Death of Joseph	144	
Birth of Aaron	83	
Birth of Moses	80	

To transform the dates into the ordinary reckoning B.C., it is only necessary to add the date previously adopted for the Exodus, and we thus obtain

	Massorete B.C.	Samaritan B.C.	Septuagint B.C.
The Creation	3700	4001	5086
The Deluge	2044	2694	2824
The Call of Abraham	1677	1677	1677
Jacob's journey to Egypt	1462	1462	1462
The Exodus	1247	1247	1247

It is possible of course to double the length of the period between Jacob and Moses, thus increasing the

total by 215 years, but even so the longest of these systems falls many centuries short of the antiquity required for the first appearance of our race or its dispersion over the world.

The only incidents falling in this period that could in any case be treated synchronistically are the appointment of Joseph as governor over Egypt, and the battle between Abraham and Chedorlaomer. So far as the Egyptian monuments are concerned we have as yet recovered no trace of Joseph. It has generally been supposed that his administration belongs to the period of the Hyksos or 'shepherd' kings, though his warning to Jacob in Gen. xlvi. 34 ("Every shepherd is an abomination to the Egyptians") would rather suggest that it might be after their expulsion. Still the tradition connecting, and partially identifying, the Israelites with the Hyksos is an ancient one, and a parallel tradition with still greater precision assigns the government of Joseph to the reign of Apophis or Apepi. There are very few remains of the Hyksos period. Like the Turks of later days, they remained an army of invaders and left no permanent memorial. Their occupation of the country is said by Josephus to have lasted 511 years, and by Julius Africanus 518, and their date according to the latest Egyptian chronology, that of Professor Petrie, is B.C. 2098–1587. The date of Apophis cannot really be determined with any probability of correctness.

The synchronism between Abraham and Chedorlaomer is almost as obscure as that between Joseph and the unknown Pharaoh. The fourteenth chapter of Genesis is no part of the Priestly Code, nor of any of the usual documents or traditions found underlying the Hexateuch. Coming then as it does from extraneous sources it need not be deemed very wonderful if it should be found not to harmonize with the chronological framework of the Priestly Code.

It is not to be expected that the Babylonian and Chaldean chronology of this period should exhibit the perfect precision and accuracy that we find from the ninth century onwards. We are able, however, to obtain a fairly close approximation to the true dates. So far as dependence is placed on Greek historians with calculations of dates in "years before the fall of Troy," some hesitancy in accepting their conclusions is permissible[1]; but when we depend on native Babylonian records, even though they be eighteen centuries later, we are entitled to feel more confidence in our results; and indeed considering the remoteness of the period, the reliance that can at all times be placed on the Babylonian records is justly regarded as remarkable.

The famous Khammurabi reigned for fifty-five

[1] In some cases the Greek is only known through its Latin translation. It is rather amusing to find that the genitive Ἴλιον has sometimes been translated according to the sound rather than the spelling, so that we get *Ante* (or even *Post*) *Vastationem Solis!*

years, and his accession is usually dated B.C. 2285. He has been identified with the "Amraphel King of Shinar" of Genesis xiv. 1, but the identification is doubtful. Others would identify Amraphel with Khammurabi's father Sin-muballit, whose name appears in ideographs as Amar-Pal. The name Chedorlaomer corresponds to Kudur-Lagamar, a name that has not yet been found among the kings of the Elamite Dynasty, though it has its parallels in Kudur-Mabug and Kudur-Nakhunta. "Arioch King of Ellasar" may be plausibly identified with Eriaku, the viceroy of Larsa. It is clear therefore that in this fourteenth chapter of Genesis we are dealing with actual historical personages, though it is impossible to assign them their exact dates, and the dates apparently obtainable from Babylonian remains are several centuries distant from those obtained from the ordinary Hebrew sources.

But the futility of attempting to frame a perfect chronology for this period becomes manifest when we reflect that, according to the Massoretic chronology, at the time of the battle of the Vale of Siddim, Shem was still living at an age approaching five hundred, and Noah was but recently dead at the age of nine hundred and fifty! And even though we reject the Massorete chronology and follow the Septuagint, as the longest of the three, the advantage of doing so will be apparent rather than real. For in any case

we should find both before and after the Deluge that the patriarchs are represented as repeatedly exceeding the age of nine hundred at a time when the contemporary kings of countries in their immediate neighbourhood seem to have been confined to the ordinary limits of human life. Under such circumstances it is vain to look for any real synchronism at all. The chronology of the Priestly Code clearly stands by itself; it bears no relation to that of other countries, and it cannot be rationally translated into our modern reckoning of years B.C. At the same time it is too elaborate to be abandoned altogether, and the more so as we have nothing to put in its place. For the Book of Genesis it is, and must remain, supreme. Having once chosen,—arbitrarily since we can do no better,—which of the three versions we are to follow, we can fix the date of each event recorded in the Book of Genesis in terms of years from the Creation with almost unfailing accuracy, though with little confidence of any historical justification. From the Exodus onward the reckoning in years B.C. may be applied without risk of serious error, with some hesitation indeed as to the intermediate dates in the time of the judges, but with growing confidence as we proceed, until in the days of the divided monarchy and the restoration we attain almost perfect certitude as to the correctness of our results.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE PROPHETS.

In dealing with the chronology of the Prophets I have no wish to attempt the solution of any intricate literary problems. But since the prophets occupy so important a place in the Old Testament it is perhaps as well to shew how their dates are affected by the chronology here proposed.

Isaiah. The earliest definite date in the Book of Isaiah is "the year that King Uzziah died" (B.C. 739). The latest is the destruction of Sennacherib's army (B.C. 701). The prophecies doubtless began shortly before the earlier of these dates, and Isaiah probably survived Hezekiah (B.C. 688).

Isaiah II (Ch. xl.–lxvi.). These belong to the period of the Return and may be dated B.C. 538.

Jeremiah began his prophetic ministry in the 13th year of Josiah (B.C. 627). The book concludes with the release of Jehoiachin by Evil-Merodach in the 37th year of his captivity (B.C. 562). As Nebuchadrezzar reigned 43 years, this is also the year of Evil-Merodach's accession.

EZEKIEL'S chronology is very precise. The book begins in the 5th year of Jehoiachin's captivity (B.C. 594). In the 12th year of the Captivity (B.C. 587) he receives tidings, on the 5th day of the 10th month, of the fall of Jerusalem, which had actually taken place on the 7th day of the 5th month. The synchronism with the chronology of Zedekiah's reign is therefore perfect. The latest date in the book is the 27th year of the Captivity (B.C. 572).

DANIEL. The traditional Daniel begins with the 3rd year of Jehoiakim (B.C. 606) and apparently extends to the reign of Darius (B.C. 521–486), who seems to be put before Cyrus. If the third year of Cyrus is regarded as the last date, the book will end in B.C. 536. But in its present form at least the Book of Daniel must be referred to the end of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (B.C. 164).

HOSEA prophesied during the reign of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah in Judah, and Jeroboam II in Israel. The date may be fixed approximately as B.C. 755–711.

JOEL'S date cannot be determined with any certainty.

AMOS gives as his date the reign of Uzziah king of Judah and Jeroboam II king of Israel adding significantly "two years before the earthquake." If this is the earthquake associated with the sacrilege and deposition of Uzziah, the date will be about B.C. 752.

The controversy with Amaziah the priest of Bethel before the death of Jeroboam II would be about B.C. 755. These two dates will serve to indicate the period very closely.

OBADIAH is usually dated soon after the fall of Jerusalem (B.C. 587).

JONAH the son of Amittai lived in the reign of Jeroboam II (B.C. 783–754), but the Book of Jonah was apparently written at a much later date.

MICAH prophesied in the reigns of Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah. The limits of this period are covered by the dates B.C. 739–688.

NAHUM, according to Josephus (1 *Antiq.* xi. 3), lived in the reign of Jotham (B.C. 739–734). Josephus also gives the date as 115 years before the fall of Nineveh, possibly connecting that event with the accession of Nabopolassar (B.C. 625). It seems certain, however, that the real date of the book must be associated with the fall of No-Amon (Nah. iii. 8) or Thebes. This would give B.C. 663 as the probable date.

HABAKKUK prophesied when the hostile power of the Babylonians was first beginning to be felt. As Jehoiakim served Nebuchadrezzar for three years (2 Kings xxiv. 1) this might well be B.C. 601.

ZEPHANIAH prophesied in the days of Josiah. He was fourth in descent from a Hezekiah, who was probably the king of that name. It is generally

supposed that these prophecies fall in the earlier part of Josiah's reign (B.C. 640–622) prior to the discovery of the Book of the Law.

HAGGAI'S date is given precisely as the second year of Darius B.C. 520.

ZECHARIAH was contemporary with Haggai, and is dated the second and fourth years of Darius (B.C. 520–518). The last six chapters are often supposed to be of much earlier date and prior to the Captivity.

MALACHI was associated either with Ezra (B.C. 458) or with Nehemiah (B.C. 433), more probably the latter. The expression in 2 Esdras i. 40 and some other considerations leave us in doubt as to the actual name of "My Messenger."

EGYPTIAN CHRONOLOGY.

THE study of Egyptian Chronology is a necessary adjunct to that of Biblical Chronology. In this case we are dependent on two principal authorities. One is the Turin Papyrus, a list of kings compiled in the time of the Nineteenth Dynasty, and the other is the list of kings and dynasties preserved by Manetho, an Egyptian priest of Sebennytus contemporary with Ptolemy Philadelphus. Had we the fortune to possess them in their original and perfect form, it is probable that they would be found to agree as the Egyptian and Greek versions of the same canon of kings. Most unfortunately however, the Turin Papyrus is in a terrible state of dilapidation, and Manetho is only known to us at second or third hand in fragments quoted, copied, and apparently revised, by later scholars. The best version of Manetho is apparently that of Julius Africanus, preserved to us by George Syncellus. This is the only one approaching completeness and it ought to be made the basis of the chronology.

In addition to Manetho and the Turin Papyrus we have the records of the monuments themselves. These may be regarded as giving us a fairly complete chronological system from the accession of the Nineteenth Dynasty, B.C. *circa* 1590. Prior to that date

we can do little more than depend on dead reckoning from Julius Africanus. We have, however, one most important check belonging to a period of remote antiquity. This depends on the date of the Fall of the Nile in the reign of Merenra or Methusuphis, the third king of the Sixth Dynasty. The conditions of the problem are apparently satisfied by the commencement of the month Epiphi, neither earlier than Sept. 29 nor later than Oct. 13. The former of these dates would correspond to B.C. 3326, the latter to B.C. 3382. It is necessary, however, to apply a further correction for the error of the Julian Calendar itself, which at that time amounted to twenty-seven days. The exact date of the monument must therefore be placed between B.C. 3434 and B.C. 3490. According to the dead reckoning of Julius Africanus the date of Methusuphis falls B.C. 3456–3449, which is in exact agreement with the date required by the inscription. It must be acknowledged that there are many errors in Julius Africanus, but over the whole period the uncertainty seems now to be one of a generation or two at the most and not one of many centuries.

The following is the general scheme of Manetho's Dynasties. It is necessary of course to deduct a year from the chronology at the end of each Sothic Cycle, thus apparently shortening the Third, Ninth, and Eighteenth Dynasties by one year each.

GENERAL SCHEME OF MANETHO'S DYNASTIES.

CHIEFLY ACCORDING TO JULIUS AFRICANUS.

Dynasty	Kings	Capital	Years	B.C.
I	8	This	263	4819—4556
II	9	This	302	4556—4254
III	9	Memphis	214	4254—4041
IV	8	Memphis	284	4041—3757
V	9	Elephantine	218	3757—3539
VI	6	Memphis	203	3539—3336
VII	70	Memphis	(70 days)	3336
VIII	27	Memphis	146	3336—3190
IX	19	Heracleum	409	3190—2782
X	19	Heracleum	185	2782—2597
XI	17	Diospolis	59	2597—2538
XII	7	Diospolis	160	2538—2378
XIII	60	Diospolis	453	2378—1925
XIV	76	Xois	184	1925—1741
XV	6	*Hyksos*	284	2108—1824
XVI	32	*Hyksos*	518	2108—1590
XVII	43	Diospolis	151	1741—1590
XVIII	16	Diospolis	263	1590—1328
XIX	5	Diospolis	94	1328—1234
XX	12	Diospolis	135	1234—1099
XXI	7	Tanis	150	1099—949
XXII	9	Bubastis	170	949—779
XXIII	4	Tanis	58	779—721
XXIV	1	Saïs	6	721—715
XXV	3	*Ethiopian*	50	715—665
XXVI	9	Saïs	140	665—525
XXVII	8	*Persian*	120	525—405
XXVIII	1	Saïs	6	405—399
XXIX	4	Mendes	21	399—378
XXX	3	Sebennytus	38	378—340

MANETHO'S EGYPTIAN DYNASTIES.

Julius Africanus.			*Eusebius.*		
		Years			Years
Dynasty I. Thinite.					
1.	Menes	62	1.	Menes	30
2.	Athothis	57	2.	Athosthis	27
3.	Cencenes	31	3.	Cencenes	39
4.	Venephes	23	4.	Venephes	42
5.	Usaphædus	20	5.	Usaphaes	20
6.	Miebidus	26	6.	Niebes	26
7.	Semempses	18	7.	Semempses	18
8.	Bienaches	26	8.	Ubienthes	26
	(Stated as 253)	263		(Stated as 252)	228
Dynasty II. Thinite.					
1.	Boethus	38	1.	Bochus	
2.	Cæechos	39	2.	Choos or Cechous	
3.	Binothris	47	3.	Biophis	
4.	Tlas	17	4.		
5.	Sethenes	41	5.		
6.	Chæres	17	6.		
7.	Nephercheres	25	7.		
8.	Sesochris	48	8.	Sesochris	
9.	Cheneres	30	9.		
		302			297
Dynasty III. Memphite.					
1.	Necherophes	28	1.	Necherochis	
2.	Tosorthrus	29	2.	Sesorthus	
3.	Tyris	7			
4.	Mesochris	17			
5.	Soyphis	16			

Julius Africanus *Eusebius.*

DYNASTY III. Memphite (*continued*).

		Years		Years
6.	Tosertasis	19		
7.	Aches	42		
8.	Sephuris	30		
9.	Cerpheres	26		
		214		197

DYNASTY IV. Memphite.

1.	Soris	29	1.	
2.	Suphis	63	2.	
3.	Suphis	66	3.	Suphis
4.	Mencheres	63	4.	
5.	Ratœses	25		
6.	Bicheris	22		
7.	Sebercheres	7	16.	
8.	Thamphthis	9	17.	
(Also stated as 274)		284		448

DYNASTY V. Elephantinian.

1.	Usercheres	28	31 Kings. Names not mentioned. Othoes and Phiops of the next Dynasty are mistakenly described as the 1st and 4th Kings of this Dynasty.
2.	Sephres	13	
3.	Nephercheres	20	
4.	Sisires	7	
5.	Cheres	20	
6.	Rathures (or 41)	44	
7.	Mencheres	9	
8.	Tancheres	44	
9.	Obnus	33	
	(Stated as 248)	218	Duration not stated

Julius Africanus.		*Eusebius.*	
	DYNASTY VI. Memphite.		
	Years		Years
1. Othoes	30	1. Othoes	
2. Phius	53		
3. Methusuphis	7		
4. Phiops (qy. 94?)	100	4. Phiops (qy. 94?)	100
5. Menthesuphis	1		
6. Nitocris (Queen)	12	Nitocris	
	203		203
	DYNASTY VII. Memphite.		
70 Kings reigned 70 days		5 Kings reigned 75 days (or 75 years)	
	DYNASTY VIII. Memphite.		
27 Kings	146	5 Kings	100
	DYNASTY IX. Heracleopolite.		
1. Achthoes		1. Achthos	
2—19.		2—4.	
	409		100
	DYNASTY X. Heracleopolite.		
19 Kings	185	19 Kings	185
	DYNASTY XI. Diospolite.		
16 Kings	43	16 Kings	43
Ammenemes	16	Ammenemes	16

End of Manetho's first Book, containing 192 Kings, who reigned 2308 years and 70 days. The actual total, according to the numbers in Julius Africanus, is 2283 years and 70 days.

Julius Africanus. *Eusebius.*

DYNASTY XII. Diospolite.

	Years		Years
1. Sesonchosis	46	1. Sesonchosis	46
2. Ammanemes	38	2. Ammenemes	38
3. Sesostris	48	3. Sesostris	48
4. Lachares	8	4. Labares	8
5. Ammeres	8	5.)	42
6. Ammenemes	8	6.)	
7. Scemiophris, Queen	4	7.	
	160	(Stated as 245)	182

DYNASTY XIII. Diospolite.

60 Kings	453	60 Kings	453

DYNASTY XIV. Xoite.

76 Kings	184	76 Kings	484

Julius Africanus. *Josephus.* *Eusebius.*

DYNASTY XV. DYNASTY XVII.

Phoenician Shepherds. Shepherds. Phoenician Shepherds.

	Years		Y.	M.		Years
1. Saïtes	19	1. Salatis	19		1. Saïtes	19
2. Beon	44	2. Beon	44		2. Bnon (or 43)	40
		3. Apachnas	36	7	3. Archles	30
3. Pachnan	61	4. Apophis	61		4. Apophis	14
4. Staan	50	5. Janias	50	1	(Archles and Apophis transposed in other copies.)	
5. Archles	49	6. Assis	49	2		
6. Aphobis	61					
	284		259	10		103

Julius Africanus.		*Josephus.*			*Eusebius.*	
DYNASTY XVI.					DYNASTY XV.	
	Years		Y.	M.		Years
32 Greek Shepherds	518	Shepherds	511		Diospolites	250
DYNASTY XVII.					DYNASTY XVI.	
43 Shepherd Kings 43 Theban Diospolites	151	.....			5 Theban Kings	190
DYNASTY XVIII.					DYNASTY XVIII.	
Diospolite.			Y.	M.	Diospolite.	
1. Amos	25	1. Tethmosis	25	4	1. Amosis	25
2. Chebros	13	2. Chebron	13		2. Chebron	13
3. Amenophthis	24	3. Amenophis	20	7	3. Amenophis	21
4. Amersis	22	4. Amesses	21	9		
5. Misaphris	13	5. Mephres	12	9	4. Miphris	12
6. Misphragmuthosis	26	6. Mephramuthosis	25	10	5. Misphragmuthosis	26
7. Tuthmosis	9	7. Thmosis	9	8	6. Tuthmosis	9
8. Amenophis	31	8. Amenophis	30	10	7. Amenophis	31
9. Horus	37	9. Orus	36	5	8. Orus (or 28)	38
10. Acherres	32	10. Acenchres	12	1	9. Achencherses (or 16)	12
11. Rathos	6	11. Rathotis	9		10. Achoris (or 38)	7
12. Chebres	12	12. Acencheres	12	5	11. Cencheres (or 16)	18
13. Acherres	12	13. Acencheres	12	3	12. Acherres	8
14. Armesses	5	14. Armais	4	1	13. Cherres	15
15. Ramesses	1	15. Ramesses	1	4	14. Armais	5
16. Amenophath	19				15. Ramesses	68
					16. Amenophis	40
(Stated as 263)	287		247	4	Stated as	348

Julius Africanus.		*Josephus.*			*Eusebius.*	
DYNASTY XIX.					DYNASTY XIX.	
Diospolite.					Diospolite.	
	Years		Y.	M.		Years
1. Sethos	51				1. Sethos	55
2. Rapsaces	61	Armesses	66	2	2. Rampses	66
3. Ammenephthes	20	Amenophis	19	6	3. Amenephthis (or 8)	40
4. Ramesses	60	Sethosis			4. Amenemnes	26
5. Ammemnes	5	Ramesses			5. Thuoris	7
6. Thuoris	7					
(Stated as 209)	204					194

End of Manetho's second Book, containing 96 Kings (92 Eus.) who reigned 2121 years.

Julius Africanus.		*Eusebius.*	
DYNASTY XX. Diospolite.			
	Years		Years
12 Kings	135	12 Kings	172 or 178
DYNASTY XXI. Tanite.			
1. Smendes	26	1. Smendis	26
2. Psusenes	46	2. Psusennes	41
3. Nephelcheres	4	3. Nephercheres	4
4. Amenophthis	9	4. Amenophthis	9
5. Osochor	6	5. Osochor	6
6. Psinaches	9	6. Psinnaches	9
7. Psusennes	14	7. Psusennes	35
(Stated as 130)	114		130

Julius Africanus.		*Eusebius.*	
	DYNASTY XXII. Bubastite.		
	Years		Years
1. Sesonchis	21	1. Sesenchosis	21
2. Osorthon	15	2. Osorthon	15
3, 4, 5.	25		
6. Tacelothis	13	3. Tacellothis	13
7, 8, 9.	42		
(Stated as 120)	116	(Stated as 44)	49
	DYNASTY XXIII. Tanite.		
1. Petubates	40	1. Petubastes	25
2. Osorcho	8	2. Osorthon	9
3. Psammus	10	3. Psammus	10
4. Zet	31		
	89		44
	DYNASTY XXIV. Saïte.		
Bocchoris	6	Bocchoris	44
	DYNASTY XXV. Ethiopian.		
1. Sabacon	8	1. Sabbacon	12
2. Sebichos	14	2. Sevichus	12
3. Tarcus	18	3. Taracus	20
	40		44
	DYNASTY XXVI. Saïte.		
		1. Ammeres	18
1. Stephinates	7	2. Stephanathis	7
2. Nechepsos	6	3. Nechepsos	6
3. Nechao	8	4. Nechao	6
4. Psammetichus	54	5. Psammitichus	44

Julius Africanus.			*Eusebius.*		
DYNASTY XXVI. Saïte (*continued*).					
		Years			Years
5.	Nechao	6	6.	Nechao	6
6.	Psammuthis	6	7.	Psammuthis	17
7.	Vaphris	19	8.	Vaphris	25
8.	Amosis	44	9.	Amosis	42
9.	Psammecherites	(6 m.)			
		150½		(Stated as 167)	171
DYNASTY XXVII. Persian.					
1.	Cambyses	6	1.	Cambyses	3
2.	Darius	36	2.	Magi	(7 m.)
3.	Xerxes	21	3.	Darius	36
4.	Artabanus	(7 m.)	4.	Xerxes	21
5.	Artaxerxes	41	5.	Artaxerxes	40
6.	Xerxes	(2 m.)	6.	Xerxes	(2 m.)
7.	Sogdianus	(7 m.)	7.	Sogdianus	(7 m.)
8.	Darius	19	8.	Darius	19
		124⅓			120⅓
DYNASTY XXVIII. Saïte.					
	Amyrtæus	6		Amyrtæus	6
DYNASTY XXIX. Mendesian.					
1.	Nepherites	6	1.	Nepherites	6
2.	Achoris	13	2.	Achoris	13
3.	Psammuthis	1	3.	Psammuthes	1
4.	Nepherites	(4 m.)	4.	Nepherites	(4 m.)
			5.	Muthes	1
		20⅓			21⅓

	Julius Africanus.		*Eusebius.*	
	DYNASTY XXX. Sebennytic.			
		Years		Years
1.	Nectanebes	18	Nectanebes	10
2.	Teos	2	Teos	2
3.	Nectanebes	18	Nectanebes	8
		38		20
	DYNASTY XXXI. Persian.			
1.	Ochus	2	Ochus	6
2.	Arses	3	Arses	4
3.	Darius	4	Darius	6
		9		16

End of Manetho's third Book extending over 1050 years.

KINGS OF EGYPT.

FROM THE EXPULSION OF THE HYKSOS TO THE PERSIAN CONQUEST.

DYNASTY XVIII.

	Equivalent name in Manetho.		
	Sayce	Petrie	B.C.
Aahmes	Amosis	Amosis	1590
Queen Nefertari-Aahmes	Chebron		
Amenhotep I	Amenophis	Amenophis	1565
Thothmes I		Tethmosis	1541
Thothmes II		Chebron	1516
Queen Hatasu	Amersis	Amersis	1503
Thothmes III	Misaphris	Misaphris	1481

DYNASTY XVIII (*continued*).

	Equivalent name in Manetho.		
	Sayce	Petrie	B.C.
Amenhotep II	Mephramu-thosis	Mephramuthosis	1449
Thothmes IV	Tuthmosis	Tuthmosis	1423
Amenhotep III	Amenophis	Amenophis	1413
Khuenaten	Horus	Horus	1382
Saanekht	Acherres	Acherres	1363
Tutankhamen	Rathotis	Rathotis	1351
Ai		Acencheres	1345
Horemhebi	Armais	Armais	1333

DYNASTY XIX.

Ramessu I	Ramesses (XVIII dyn.)	1328
Seti I	Sethos	1326
Ramessu II	Armesses	1318
Menephthah	Amenophis	1252
Seti II	Sethosis	1244
Amenmeses	Amenemnes	1244
Siptah		1240
Queen Tausert	Thuoris	1240
Setinekht		1234

DYNASTY XX.

Ramessu III	(Rhampsinitus)	1234
Ramessu XIV		1099

DYNASTY XXI.

Legitimate Succession.		Hierarchical Succession.	
Nesibadadu (Smendes)	1099	Herhor	1099
Pasebkhanu I	1073	Piankh	
		Pinetem I	
Amenapt		Menkhephra	
Siamen		Nesi Banebdadu	
	993	Pinetem II	993
Pasebkhanu II	984-949	Pasebkhanu	984–949

Dynasty XXII.

	B.C.
Sheshonk (=Shishak)	949
Osorkon (=Zerah)	928
Takelut	892
Osorkon II	
Sheshonk II	
Takelut II	
Sheshonk III	837
Pamai	785
Sheshonk IV	785–748
Ethiopian Kings.	
Piankhi	748
Kashta	725
Dynasty XXV.	
Shabak (=So)	715
Shabatok	707
Tehrak (=Tirhakah)	693–665

The Chronology is difficult to trace, owing to the gaps in Manetho and the overlapping of the reigns. Petubastes is said by Manetho to have been king at the time of the First Olympiad (B.C. 776), in which case the XXII and XXIII Dynasties must also overlap.

Dynasty XXIII.

	B.C.
Petubast	779 (or 810)
Osorkon III	739 (or 770)
Psammus	731 (or 762)
Zet?	—752?

Dynasty XXIV.

Bekenranf	721–715

Dynasty XXVI.

Ammeres	704
Stephinates	686
Nechepsos	679
Neko I	673

Dynasty XXVI.

Monuments	Manetho	Herodotus	B.C.
Psamatik I	Psammetichus	Psammetichus	665
Neko II (=Necoh)	Nechao	Necos	611
Psamatik II	Psammuthis	Psammis	595
Uabhra (=Hophra)	Vaphris	Apries	589
Aahmes	Amosis	Amasis	570
Psamatik III	Psammecherites	Psammenitus	526
		The Persian Conquest	525

THE EGYPTIAN CALENDAR.

I	Thoth	30 days
II	Paophi	30 ,,
III	Athyr	30 ,,
IV	Choiach	30 ,,
V	Tybi	30 ,,
VI	Mechir	30 ,,
VII	Phamenoth ...	30 ,,
VIII	Pharmuthi ...	30 ,,
IX	Pachons	30 ,,
X	Payni	30 ,,
XI	Epiphi	30 ,,
XII	Mesore	30 ,,
	Intercalary Days	5 ,,
		365 ,,

CHRONOLOGY OF ASSYRIA AND OTHER COUNTRIES.

KINGS OF TYRE.

According to Menander and Josephus.

	Born B.C.	Reigned B.C.
Abibal		—979
Hirom, son... ...	998	979—945
Baleazar, son ...	981	945—938
Abdastartus, son ...	958	938—929
An unknown Usurper		929—917
Astartus	959	917—905
Aserymus, brother ...	950	905—896
Pheles, brother ...	946	896
Ithobalus (Eth-Baal)	932	896—864
Badezor, son ...	903	864—858
Matgenus, son ...	881	858—849
Pygmalion, son ...	858	849—802
Foundation of Carthage		843

KINGS OF ASSYRIA.

From the Tenth Century.

	B.C.
Tiglath-Pileser II	—
Assur-daan II	—
Rimmon-nirari II	911
Tiglath-Uras II	889
Assur-nazir-pal	883
Shalmaneser II	858
Assur-daan-pal	825
Samsi-Rimmon II	823
Rimmon-nirari III	810
Shalmaneser III	781
Assur-daan III	771
Assur-nirari	753
Tiglath-Pileser III (Pul)	745
Shalmaneser IV	727
Sargon	722
Sennacherib	705
Esar-haddon I	681
Assur-bani-pal	668
Assur-etil-ilani-yukinni	648
Sin-sarra-iskun	—
Esar-haddon II	—
Destruction of Nineveh	606

PTOLEMY'S CANON.

Kings reigning less than a year are omitted from the Canon.

Kings of the Babylonians.

	Years	Total from Nabonassar	B.C.
Nabonassar	14	14	747—734
Nadius	2	16	733—732
Chinzirus and Porus ...	5	21	731—727
Jugæus...	5	26	726—722
Mardocempadus (Merodach-Baladan)	12	38	721—710
Arcianus (Sarcianus? = Sargon)	5	43	709—705
Interregnum (Revolt) ...	2	45	704—703
Belibus	3	48	702—700
Apronadius	6	54	699—694
Rigebelus	1	55	693
Mesessimordacus ...	4	59	692—689
Interregnum	8	67	688—681
Assaradinus (Esar-haddon)	13	80	680—668
Saosducheus	20	100	667—648
Chuniladanus	22	122	647—626
Nabopolassar	21	143	625—605
Nabocolassar (Nebuchadrezzar)	43	186	604—562
Iluarodamus (Evil-Merodach)	2	188	561—560
Niricassolassar	4	192	559—556
Laborosoarchod Nabonadius	17	209	555—539

Kings of the Persians.

Cyrus	9	218	538—530
Cambyses	8	226	529—522
Gomates Darius I	36	262	521—486

KINGS OF THE PERSIANS (*continued*).

	Years	Total from Nabonassar	B.C.
Xerxes I	21	283	485—465
Artaxerxes I	41	324	464—424
Xerxes II			
Sogdianus			
Darius II	19	343	423—405
Artaxerxes II	46	389	404—359
Ochus	21	410	358—338
Arostes	2	412	337—336
Darius III	4	416	335—332

KINGS OF THE GREEKS.

	Years	Total from the death of Alexander	Total from Nabonassar	B.C.
Alexander ...	8		424	331—324
Philip Aridæus ...	7	7	431	323—317
Alexander Ægus ...	12	19	443	316—305

GREEK KINGS IN EGYPT.

Ptolemy Lagus ...	20	39	463	304—285
Philadelphus	38	77	501	284—247
Evergetes I	25	102	526	246—222
Philopator	17	119	543	221—205
Epiphanes	24	143	567	204—181
Philometor	35	178	602	180—146
Evergetes II	29	207	631	145—117
Soter ...	36	243	667	116— 81
Dionysus ...	29	272	696	80— 52
Cleopatra	22	294	718	51— 30

SELEUCID KINGS OF SYRIA.

	B.C.
Seleucus Nicator	312
Antiochus Soter	279
Antiochus Theus	261
Seleucus Callinicus	246
Seleucus Ceraunus	226
Antiochus the Great	223
Antiochus Philopator	187
Antiochus Epiphanes	176
Antiochus Eupator	164
Demetrius Soter	162
Alexander Balas	151
Demetrius Nicator	146
Antiochus Sidetes	140
Demetrius Nicator (*rest.*)	130
Zabinas	126
Antiochus Grypus	122
Antiochus Cyzicenus	114
Seleucus Epiphanes...	96
Philip	94
Tigranes	83
Roman Conquest	65

GOVERNORS OF JERUSALEM.

Tributary to the Persian Kings.

Zerubbabel...	B.C. 538
Completion of the second Temple ...	516
Ezra	458
Nehemiah	445-433

THE ASMONÆAN PRINCES.

Mattathias	B.C. 168
Judas	166
Jonathan	161
Simon	143
Hyrcanus I	135
Aristobulus I	105
Alexander Jannæus	104
Queen Alexandra	78
Aristobulus II	69
Hyrcanus II	63
Antigonus	40

Herod	37
Archelaus	4
Coponius	A.D. 6
M. Ambivius	9
Annius Rufus	12
Valerius Gratus	16
Pontius Pilate	27

SOME OTHER CHRONOLOGICAL SYSTEMS.

JOSEPHUS is the most important of the Jewish historians, apart from the Scriptural records themselves, and as he shews himself to have been a careful student of chronology, it is a matter of considerable interest and importance to determine the system underlying his history. This may be found either from the headings to each book of the *Antiquities*, where the number of years contained in the book is stated with every appearance of exactness, or by reference to the most important epochs, where he carefully calculates the length of the period since the greatest events in past history.

The two systems are not quite consistent, as he has treated the two kingdoms of Israel and Judah independently of one another, thus involving an error of about twenty years. Again, by reckoning the Babylonian Captivity at seventy years from the fall of Jerusalem an additional error of twenty years is introduced. The discrepancy is made up on the other side, though by no means atoned for, by adding

forty years to the period between the first of Cyrus and the death of Alexander.

The length of the first book is given, in Whiston at least, as 3833 years, an obvious error for 3533 years. Taking B.C. 323 as the unquestionable date of Alexander's death, the chronology is as follows :—

	B.C.	A.M.
The Creation	5421	1
The Deluge	3165	2257
The Birth of Abraham	2173	3249
The Call of Abraham	2098	3324
The Death of Isaac	1888	3534
The Exodus	1668	3754
The Rejection of that Generation	1666	3756
The Death of Moses	1628	3794
The Death of Eli	1152	4270
The Death of Saul	1120	4302
The Death of David	1080	4342
The Foundation of the Temple	1076	4346
The Revolt of the Ten Tribes ...	1000	4422
The Death of Ahab	917	4505
The Captivity of the Ten Tribes	760	4662
The Destruction of the Temple	606	4816
The First of Cyrus	577 537	4845 4885
The Death of Alexander ...	323	5099

A somewhat similar chronology long contested the field with the shorter system of Ussher, but neither can now be regarded as of more than academic interest. The following is a scheme of the cardinal points of the most renowned ancient and modern chronologies.

	The Creation	The Flood	The Call of Abram	The Exodus	Foundation of the Temple	Destruction of the Temple
	B.C.	B.C.	B.C.	B.C.	B.C.	B.C.
Jewish	3761	2105	1739	1314	835	422
Greek	5508	3246	2101	1671	1038	604
Eusebius	5200	2958	1941	1511	1032	591
Bede	3953	2297	1930	1500	1020	590
Scaliger	3950	2294	1927	1497	1018	590
Petavius	3984	2328	1961	1531	1012	588
Ussher	4004	2348	1921	1491	1012	588
Jackson	5426	3170	2023	1593	1014	586
Hales	5411	3155	2078	1648	1027	586
Clinton	4138	2482	2055	1625	1013	587

Kings of Judah.

	Hales	Clinton	Ewald	Bunsen	Duncker	Conder	Oppert	Curtis
	B.C.	B.C.	B.C.	B.C.	B.C.	B.C.	B.C.	B.C.
Rehoboam	990	976	985	968	953	971	978	937
Abijah	973	959	968	951	932	954	960	920
Asa	970	956	965	948	929	951	958	917
Jehoshaphat	929	915	917	907	873	910	917	876
Jehoram	904	891	892	882	848	885	892	851
Ahaziah	896	884	885	874	844	877	888	843
Athaliah	895	883	883	873	843	876	887	842
Jehoash	889	877	877	867	837	870	881	836
Amaziah	849	837	837	827	797	830	840	796
Uzziah	809	808	808	798	792	801	811	767
Jotham	757	756	756	746	740	749	758	737
Ahaz	741	741	740	730	734	733	742	735
Hezekiah	725	726	724	714	728	717	727	715
Manasseh	696	697	695	685	697	688	698	686
Amon	641	642	640	640	642	633	642	641
Josiah	639	640	638	638	640	631	640	639

KINGS OF JUDAH (*continued*).

	Hales B.C.	Clinton B.C.	Ewald B.C.	Bunsen B.C.	Duncker B.C.	Conder B.C.	Oppert B.C.	Curtis B.C.
Jehoahaz	608	609	608	607	609	600	609	608
Jehoiakim	608	609	608	607	608	600	609	608
Jehoiachin	597	598	597	596	597	589	598	597
Zedekiah	597	598	597	596	596	588	598	597
Fall of Jerusalem	586	587	586	586	586	577	587	586

KINGS OF ISRAEL.

Jeroboam	990	976	985	968	953	971	977	937
Nadab	968	955	963	946	927	950	956	915
Baasha	966	954	961	944	925	949	955	914
Elah	943	931	937	921	901	925	932	890
Zimri	942	930	935	920	899	924	931	889
Omri	942	930	931	920	893	924	931	889
Ahab	931	919	919	908	875	913	920	875
Ahaziah	909	897	897	886	853	892	900	853
Joram	907	896	895	884	851	891	899	852
Jehu	895	883	883	872	843	877	887	842
Jehoahaz	867	855	855	844	815	847	859	815
Joash	850	839	839	827	798	832	842	798
Jeroboam II	834	823	823	811	790	816	825	782
Zechariah	771	771	770	751	749	764	773	741
Shallum	771	770	770	751	749	763	772	741
Menahem	770	770	769	750	748	763	772	741
Pekahiah	760	759	759	739	738	752	761	737
Pekah	758	757	757	737	736	750	759	736
Hoshea	728	730	728	717	734	729	730	734
Fall of Samaria	719	721	719	709	722	721	721	722

SUMMARY OF MANETHO'S DYNASTIES.

	Lepsius	Brugsch	Petrie	Mariette
	B.C.	B.C.	B.C.	B.C.
I	3892	4455	4777	5004
II	3639	4202	4514	4751
III	3338	3900	4212	4449
IV	3124	3686	3998	4235
V	2840	3402	3721	3951
VI	2744	3204	3503	3703
VII	2592	3001	3322	3500
VIII	2522	3001	3252	3500
IX	2674	3001	3106	3358
X	2565	2901	3006	3249
XI	2423	2855	2821	3064
XII	2380	2812	2778	3064
XIII	2136	2599	2565	2851
XIV	2167	2599	2112	2398
XV	2101	2146	2098	
XVI	1842	1896	1928	2214
XVII	1684	2115	1738	
XVIII	1591	1706	1587	1703
XIX	1443	1464	1327	1462
XX	1269	1288	1202	1288
XXI	1091	1110	1102	1110
XXII	961	980	952	980
XXIII	787	810	749	810
XXIV	729	721	721	721
XXV	716	715	715	715
XXVI	664	666	664	665
XXVII	525	527	525	527
XXVIII	—	—	405	406
XXIX	399	399	399	399
XXX	378	378	378	378
End of the Native Monarchy	340	340	342	340

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON THE FALL OF SAMARIA.

THIS period must be regarded as the most difficult of all, and the various solutions that have been proposed shew the greatest possible diversity from one another, and in many cases the widest divergence from the truth. For the sake of clearness the thirty considerations that must be kept in mind are added in tabular form. The true solution ought to satisfy them all.

1. The age of Jotham at the birth of Ahaz.
2. The age of Ahaz at the birth of Hezekiah.
3. Jotham reigned 16 years, some contemporaneously with Uzziah.
4. Ahaz reigned 16 years.
5. Jotham succeeded Uzziah in the 2nd year of Pekah.
6. Ahaz succeeded Jotham in the 17th (7th?) year of Pekah.
7. Hezekiah succeeded Ahaz in the 3rd (4th *Jos.*) year of Hoshea.
8. Pekahiah reigned 2 years.
9. Pekah reigned 20 years.
10. Hoshea reigned 9 years.

11. Pekahiah succeeded Menahem in the 50th year of Uzziah.
12. Pekah murdered Pekahiah in the 52nd year of Uzziah.
13. Hoshea murdered Pekah in the 20th year of Jotham (*sic*).
14. Hoshea began to reign in the 12th year of Ahaz.
15. Siege of Samaria began in the 4th year of Hezekiah.
16. Fall of Samaria occurred in the 6th year of Hezekiah.
17. Illness of Hezekiah, Alliance with Merodach-Baladan, and War with Sennacherib dated the 14th year of Hezekiah.
18. Pul, or Tiglath-Pileser, began to reign B.C. 745.
19. Shalmaneser succeeded Tiglath-Pileser B.C. 727.
20. Sargon succeeded Shalmaneser B.C. 722.
21. Sennacherib succeeded Sargon B.C. 705.
22. Tiglath-Pileser's first War in the west B.C. 743—738. Tribute paid by Uzziah and Menahem.
23. Tiglath-Pileser's second War in the west B.C. 734. Alliance with Ahaz against Pekah and Rezin.
24. Tiglath-Pileser "(kill)ed Pekah" (?) B.C. 734.
25. Sargon's capture of Samaria B.C. 722.
26. Further campaign of Sargon against the Syrian nations B.C. 711.

27. Alliance with Pharaoh king of Egypt against Sargon B.C. 715—711.
28. Accession of Shabak B.C. *circa* 715.
29. Accession of Tehrak (in Lower Egypt) B.C. *circa* 704.
30. Sennacherib's War with Merodach-Baladan, Hezekiah, and Tirhakah B.C. 703—701.

It will be seen that the chronology advocated here offers an adequate and simple explanation of the sequence and dependence of events and is perfectly consistent with each of these thirty considerations. There are, however, two cases of apparent difficulty or disagreement. One of these (No. 6) has been dealt with at full length, and the other (No. 24) is exceedingly doubtful. The chronology may therefore be regarded as firmly established. Perhaps it may be added that every alternative chronological scheme with which I am acquainted is at variance with at least seven of these considerations, and most of them with many more. Surely the harmony that is found between the various Jewish, Israelite, Egyptian, Assyrian, and Babylonian records, when once the true date of the Fall of Samaria has been determined, must contrast very favourably with violent distortions of history in which Pekah is sometimes eliminated altogether, or a second Menahem is invented, or the whole scheme of contemporary reigns is thrown into confusion.

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A., AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

The Three Additions to Daniel. The Song of the Three Holy Children—The History of Susanna—The History of Bel and the Dragon. A Study by W. H. DAUBNEY, B.D. Crown 8vo., cloth. 5*s.* net.

Studies of Arianism. Chiefly referring to the Character and Chronology of the Reaction which followed the Council of Nicæa. By H. M. GWATKIN, M.A., Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Cambridge. Second Edition, demy 8vo., cloth. Price 10*s.* net.

Sancti Irenaei Libros V. Adversus Haereses: Textu Graeco in Locis Nonnullis locupletato, Versione Latina cum Codicibus Claremontano ac Arundeliano denuo collata, edidit W. W. HARVEY. Cantabrigiae, 1857. Two Vols. 8vo., cloth. With Facsimiles. (Published at £1. 16*s.*) 9*s.* net.

Codex S. Ceaddae Latinus. Evangelia SSS Matthaei, Marci, Lucae, ad Cap. III. 9 complectens. Cum codice versionis Vulgatae Amiatino contulit, prolegomena conscripsit, F. A. H. SCRIVENER, A.M., D.C.L., LL.D. (Published at £1. 1*s.*) 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

By the REV. HENRY LATHAM, M.A., late Master of Trinity Hall, Cambridge.

Twelfth Thousand.

Pastor Pastorum; or, the Schooling of the Apostles of our Lord. Crown 8vo. 6*s.* 6*d.*

Fifth Thousand.

The Risen Master. A Sequel to 'Pastor Pastorum.' Revised, with 2 Photogravure Plates. Cr. 8vo., cloth. 6*s.*

Fourth Thousand.

A Service of Angels. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Psalms in Three Collections. Translated, with Notes, by E. G. KING, D.D. Cr. 4to., cloth. 12*s.* net.

Also in Three Parts, sewed.

First Collection, Psalms I.—XLI. 6*s.* Second Collection, Psalms XLII.—LXXXIX. 6*s.* Third Collection, Psalms XC.—CL. 5*s.*

CAMBRIDGE DEIGHTON BELL & CO.
LONDON GEORGE BELL & SONS.

14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED

LOAN DEPT.

This book is due on the last date stamped below, or on the date to which renewed.
Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

17 Mar '64 BG

REC'D LD
MAR 16 '64-8 AM

MAY 30 1969 16

REC'D LD SEP 8 '69-5PM

AUG 13 1976

REC. CIR. JUL 16 '76

LD 21A-40*m*-11,'63
(E1602s10)476B

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

M313801